THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

It is with unfeigned pleasure that this journal greets the publication of the long-expected *Festschrift* in honour of C. H. Dodd. Not for a long time have we had in this country a Biblical scholar whose towering eminence (though the phrase hardly fits him physically) is acknowledged from Aberdeen to Uppsala, and from Baltimore to Erlangen. And the book of five hundred and fifty pages which has appeared under the title of *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* [1] is worthy of the man.

The chief actors in this conspiracy of friendship have been W. D. Davies and David Daube, the joint editors. The first, an old pupil of the *maestro*, is now Professor in Princeton; the second, himself an orthodox Jew, holds the Chair of Civil Law in Oxford where Dodd now lives in his retirement—if that word will describe the job of supervising the progress of the new translation of the Bible. In honour of their friend, Davies and Daube have mustered a team of essayists of truly international quality. Here, *inter alios*, are Cadbury and Wilder, Grant and Albright of America; Goguel and Cullmann from Paris and Basel; Bultmann, Stauffer and Bornkamm from Germany; Riesenfeld and Dahl from Scandinavia; not to mention British names like Barrett and Black. The book has two sections—background and eschatology, because these are the fields in which Dodd has so notably enriched us; but the essays range over many subjects, from 'The Task of Exegesis' with which Blackman opens the book to 'Kerygma, Eschatology and Ethics' with which Wilder closes it.

Prefixed to the volume are a fine photo of Dodd (smiling down on us), a *curriculum vitae*, a list of his most important writings, and an open letter to him from the arch-conspirators. Remembering that he began his scholarly life as a numismatist, they write: 'Your scholarship was nurtured by the exacting discipline of classical studies, and your imaginative insight (Dodd is a Welshman) was born of Celtic tradition; the clarity of your thought and expression have united with these to make you a prince among exegetes.'

How to treat this noble book in short space has been quite a problem. But since we think a sentence-long summary of each of the essays would satisfy no one, we have decided to pick out two of the best essays for fuller treatment. If our choice falls on those by Albright and T. W. Manson, let no reader imagine that these two exhaust the book's riches.

W. F. Albright needs no introduction. In his own field his eminence matches Dodd's. What is interesting here is to find a great *Alttestamentler* striking a valiant blow for the Fourth Gospel's trustworthiness. Not so long ago (he begins) it was the fashion to find this Gospel shot through with Gnosticism and to relegate it to the second century. But recent research on the Gospel points in quite the opposite direction. Indeed, it can now be maintained that the material in it dates back to oral tradition in Palestine before A.D. 70. Not that Albright accepts Torrey's thesis of an Aramaic original for St. John's Gospel. In point of fact, Aramaic literature 'went out' under the Hellenistic successors of Alexander the Great in Palestine and did not revive till the second century A.D. Yet in the Fourth Gospel two things are plain and demonstrable: the Aramaic substratum of the tradition and the correctness of the Palestinian topography. (Here Albright cites some good examples of the latter: 'Gabbatha,' 'Aenon near Salim,' etc.) Now if the Gospel was written in Ephesus, as seems probable, how and when did this tradition and topography find its way there? Albright answers briefly: orally, and before A.D. 70. The great revolt of the Jews, which culminated in the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, completely broke the

[1] Cambridge University Press; 70s. net.

continuity of Christian tradition in Palestine. Moreover, even before this, bitter persecution of the Christians by intolerant Jews had caused many Palestinian Christians (among whom tradition included Peter and John) to seek refuge in the freer Christian communities of the Diaspora. Therefore if the Fourth Gospel contains good Palestinian tradition and topography, these must have been carried orally thither by Christians like the Fourth Evangelist, who left Palestine before or during the Jewish revolt. Albright therefore holds that the tradition and topography are to be dated pre-A.D. 70.

At this point some one may object that the presence of Gnostic elements in the Gospel is clear proof of the Gospel's lateness. In reply Albright first refers to the discovery in 1946 at Chenoboskion (Upper Egypt) of Gnostic codices, arguing that Gnosticism existed far earlier than the second century. But the fascinating part of his essay is the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls that this quasi-Gnostic thinking in John has probably Jewish and Palestinian sources. For in the Manual of Discipline (dated by Albright about 75 B.C.) we find the ethical dualism of good and evil, truth and falsehood, light and darkness so characteristic of St. John. The Scrolls no less than John know 'sons of light' and 'sons of darkness,' and speak of 'the light of life,' 'doing the truth' and 'the works of God.' Clearly St. John draws from a reservoir of words and ideas well known to the Essenes who produced the Scrolls. This is far from meaning that all John's doctrines are anticipated in these documents; it does mean that when we search for pointers to the spiritual background of the Fourth Gospel neither the Mandean literature nor Philo nor the Hermetic Corpus is so likely to provide the answer as the caves of Qumran.

Albright concludes that the Palestinian tradition of the Fourth Gospel with its Aramaic substratum and accurate local colour goes back to the sixties of the first century and that the Fourth Evangelist was 'a well informed Jew whose life experience was gained in Palestine in the first half of the century, and whose mother tongue was Aramaic.' He may have been John the Elder reproducing the reminiscences of John the Apostle.

Now for the second essay, T. W. Manson's. His subject is 'Present Day Research in the Life of Jesus,' and he begins by reminding us how, fifty years ago, Schweitzer faced us with this choice: 'Either you accept my eschatological reading of the Story of Jesus, or you are shut up to Wrede's, with its theory of a Messianic Secret read back into the Gospel by the evangelist.' Let us see how far later history has borne this out. The two outstanding features of Gospel criticism and interpretation in the last few decades have been Form Criticism and Realised Eschatology. The first may, not unfairly, be called Wrede's child, the second Schweitzer's. Let us take them in turn.

Form-Criticism, now thirty years old, sets out to study the narratives and teachings of Jesus in respect of their form. Classifying and labelling is its proper work, and, as such, it is interesting but not epoch-making; for a paragraph of Mark is not a penny piece the better or worse for calling it an 'apophthegm' or 'paradigm.' Contenting itself with this, Form-Criticism had made no stir. The trouble started when the Form-Critics assailed the Marcan Framework and carried their doctrine of *Sitz im Leben* to excessive lengths. For when they asked us to believe that in 'the Twilight Period' of the Church, though individual stories about Jesus were remembered, the broad outline of His Ministry was completely forgotten, they flew in the face of all the probabilities. Here Manson joins C. H. Dodd (who in 1932 in this journal wrote a notable article on the matter) in vigorously championing the reliability of the Marcan outline of the Ministry. It has, he says, as good a title to be reckoned historical as any anecdote embodied in it.

What of the doctrine of *Sitz im Leben*? It is good to try to track down the life situation of the stories and sayings of Jesus preserved in the Gospels; as it is no doubt true that the early preachers and missionaries found them very useful for kerygmatic and didactic purposes. But have the Form-Critics ever fairly considered that one main motive for Christians preserving them may have been 'just plain admiration and love for their hero'? By all means let us find out, if we can, what the early Christians made of these stories and sayings: we have no right to say, lacking proof, that they made them up. Before we blandly presume for them a *Sitz im Leben der Alten Kirche*, let us look for their setting in the Life of Jesus. (Here Manson glances at Bultmann's proposal to demythologize the Gospels and interpret the *kerygma* in terms of Heidegger's existentialism. Is this not, he asks, another name for making Jesus in our own image? And does not the great demythologizer himself produce yet another myth—the myth of the Heideggerian Jesus?)

Thus the farther we travel the *Wrede-strasse*, the plainer it becomes that it is the road to nowhere. Do we come off any better if we turn into Schweitzer's *Eschatologie-strasse* ?

Schweitzer was unquestionably right in suggesting that eschatology was a key which would unlock many of the secrets of the Gospels. The pity is he used his key so maladroitly. In his treatment of the Gospel material, particularly Matthew, his critical faculties fell asleep and, as he once told Streeter, he found Luke 'a complete enigma.' But his capital error was that he turned a Nelson eye on all the sayings in the Gospels which spoke of a Kingdom which had come : he failed to see that the Ministry of Jesus, so far from being a prelude to the Kingdom, was in a real sense the Kingdom itself. Here Manson appositely quotes Dodd on the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel. 'John's formula "the hour cometh and now is," with the emphasis on the "now is," without excluding the element of futurity, is, I believe, not merely an accurate theological definition, but is essentially historical and probably represents the authentic teaching of Jesus as veraciously as any formula could.'

The result, then, of present-day research into the life of Jesus is distinctly encouraging. We can confidently approach the Gospels as historical documents which tell a clear, coherent and credible story. Each of the anecdotes in them is 'a little window through which we can survey the Ministry as a whole, or a vantage-point from which we can take a Pisgah-view of the authentic Kingdom of God.' Historical criticism is not bankrupt. There is no need, as some imagine, to fly in despair to the Councils of the Undivided Church or to repristinate Calvinism for twentieth-century consumption. Not by looking backwards but by going boldly forward will we win the truth. Let our New Testament scholars betake themselves anew with fresh heart to their historical criticism. The story of the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is the place where true revelation of God is to be found ; and the story is a piece of real history. When it was first preached nineteen centuries ago, it was found to be relevant to the needs of men. If we will but take the trouble to present it in modern terms, we shall find that it is relevant to our needs too.

Dr. R. W. Dale of Birmingham, a noted Congregational minister of Victorian times, incurred sharp censure because of the active part which he took in politics. On one occasion a critic sent him a little book of a devotional and contemplative type with this inscription, 'There are no politics in heaven ; there is where your heart should be ; sad, sad, that it is otherwise ! ' The opinion that the Christian should be detached from the affairs of this world could hardly be expressed more plainly : and no one can deny that a strong case for that opinion can be made out from the New Testament. Our Lord said that His Kingdom was not of this world, and He warned His disciples that if they would be true to Him they would have to sit loose to natural ties and affections. His earliest followers soon found themselves in collision with the world and its ways : and again and again during the course of the centuries individuals and groups in His name have sought to recover the kind of detachment from the world prescribed in the New Testament.

On the other hand the Bible as a whole does not support this detachment or world-renunciation. It gives no encouragement to the view that matter and the things of time are inherently evil, and it affirms that God loves the world and sent His Son to save the world, not simply to save a few elect souls out of it. Moreover, the career of our Lord does not altogether bear out the other-worldly conclusion. It is John the Baptist who exemplifies world-renunciation, while our Lord is represented as living under the ordinary conditions of this world and taking an interest in all the rich variety of what we should call secular life. That does not dispose of His challenging sayings ; but it harmonises with the view that the rigour of His demands upon His first followers is explicable in part by the need for His message to make at the outset the sharpest possible impact. It must be remembered, too, that while the first Christians had no chance of political action in the Roman Empire, yet the New Testament has a high doctrine of civil government, and the Epistles show that the Church was keenly alive to the virtues of social life. Doubtless the Church was not sufficiently conscious of the perils to its life and witness when the opportunity came to influence the affairs of this world directly ; but that is not to say that its members were traitors to the faith when they undertook responsibility for civil government and concerned themselves with the whole field of civilization. Have the great majority of Christians been wrong in thinking that, though this world is destined to pass away, yet it is not worthless, and that God wanted them to do the best they could for the earthly city while their hearts aspired to the heavenly ?

What, then, is the proper attitude of the Christian to this world ? Is it world-renunciation

or world-involvement? A useful discussion of this issue has just appeared by Canon Alec R. VIDLER—*Christian Belief and This World.*[1] Looking at the Bible as a whole he sets forth an interpretation of its message in terms of the relation between this world and the other world, or between this age and the age to come. The significant feature of the New Testament message here is that though this present age or world has not yet been brought to an end, yet the age to come has already begun. In other words, we are living in a period when this age and the age to come overlap, and we are burdened with all the problems of living in two worlds at once. It is this which makes the Christian's relation to this world so difficult to determine. If we could believe that we are called to live entirely in the age to come, without any responsibilities for this age, our route would be clear, however difficult to pursue. It seems, however, that, so long as history continues, the matter is otherwise determined, and one result of our calling to live in both ages at once is that we need both the law and the gospel. Life in the age to come is God-given, and if we could live only in the age to come we should be only under the gospel. Yet we cannot dispense meantime with the law which is God's communication of His will. That communication, according to the Bible, takes place at different levels. First there is the primordial law of Nature, that sense of moral obligation and social duty which remains characteristic of man even in his fallen state; then there is the fuller communication of God's will to the chosen people, best known to us in the Ten Commandments; and finally there is the law of Christ summarized for us in the Sermon on the Mount.

The law of Christ or the law of love is the law of the age to come, yet so long as we remain in this world we are not concerned solely with it, but are still responsible for maintaining the law of God in its rudimentary and coercive forms, which are the safeguard of the security and welfare of the kingdoms of this world. That is not to say that the law of Christ is irrelevant to this age. It may be compared to the stars which remain remote, but show the direction in which men must look and towards which we should be moving even in the conduct of the affairs of this world.

A similar conclusion is reached when we consider civilization and evangelization. That the Christian is responsible for the latter is accepted; but what of the former? The Bible leaves us in no doubt that God is interested in the welfare of states as well as of churches, in work as well as worship, in health as well as holiness; and presumably He means Christians to be so too. His purpose for mankind is carried forward in the labour of civilization as well as in the labour of evangelization; indeed, we may affirm that what is wrought into the fabric of this world is of consequence for the final fabric of the world to come, for that, suggests Dr. VIDLER, is implied in the Biblical doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

If, then, the Christian is responsible for the things of this world, how may he discover what to do about them? Here our author considers the place of prophecy in the Bible and as a permanent endowment in the Church, and his conclusion is that prophecy is a gift which all Christians share and all ought to exercise. It is not, however, a purely individual gift, but is most likely to be exercised as the outcome of communion and communication both with God and with other men and women in what may be called prophetic groups. In his concluding chapter Dr. VIDLER illustrates this seeking for prophetic insight into social and political responsibilities from the experience of the Christian Frontier Council of which he is secretary.

In next month's issue the 'Important Hypotheses' series will be completed, and that issue also will see the start of an *Expository Series.* Subjects which a preacher might be expected to preach on, and which need to be re-faced in our own day, have been chosen, such as The Second Coming, The Transfiguration, God Transcendent and Immanent, Nature Miracles, the Virgin Birth, Evil Powers, The Cry of Dereliction, The Purpose of the Parables, Man Created in the Image of God, The Unforgiveable Sin, The Final Judgment and Present Justification. The subjects will be treated in relation to specific texts. Early contributors are Professor J. A. T. Robinson, Clare College, Cambridge; the Rev. G. B. Caird, McGill University, Montreal; Principal N. H. Snaith, Wesley College, Leeds; and Canon H. E. W. Turner, University of Durham.

---

[1] S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net.

Karl Barth: Appreciation and Tribute in Honour of his Seventieth Birthday

By the Reverend Professor Thomas F. Torrance, D.D., D.Theol., the University of Edinburgh

It is one of the characteristics of Beethoven's music that again and again there breaks into it a startlingly novel element which jolts you upright with a shock. You feel, 'He cannot do that. This is something illogical, a new theme that interrupts the symphony, that contradicts what we have just been hearing.' And then before you have recovered from your surprise you discover that with great profundity Beethoven has worked it into the texture of the whole symphony, and that far from being alien to the main theme it was perfectly integrated with it. Only a great genius can do that.

That is the genius of Karl Barth in the profundity and rich complexity of his *Church Dogmatics*. Even Emil Brunner was jolted into writing an article a few years ago on what he called 'The New Barth,' for in the third volume Barth appeared to convey quite new elements which Brunner welcomed warmly but which he could only interpret as a *volte face* or at least as out of harmony with what had preceded. But it was not so. The 'Christian humanism' of the new man expounded by Barth in the various parts of his third volume belonged to the very essence of his main theme.

The main theme of all Barth's theological writing has recently been described by Professor G. C. Berkouwer of Amsterdam as *The Triumph of Grace*. There can be no question that Berkouwer is right, but this is the second book he has written about Barth. After nearly twenty years he has come to revise very radically his first estimate and to publish a new work (*De Triomf der Genade in de Theologie van Karl Barth*) in which great appreciation and admiration for Barth's theology is accompanied by a tempered criticism in which Berkouwer's main concern is revealed to be essentially the same as Barth's, in the riches of God's amazing grace. I feel sure that the road from misunderstanding to deep, if also critical, appreciation taken by Berkouwer, or by James Brown in his invaluable discussion, *Subject and Object in Modern Theology*, must be the road that the theologian will take who honestly listens to Barth and is not afraid of fashionable opinion in high places!

In what follows I should like to indicate briefly some aspects of Barth's teaching which any estimate of his theological thought must take fully into account.

1. *The New Creation.* This is where the emphasis in Barth's theology has always been laid, even when in his early years at Göttingen and Münster he directed that unending stream of searching questions that probed the whole structure of Protestant philosophy and theology to its foundations until it appeared to so many that he was the advocate of a negative theology, although the truth lay in the opposite direction. That should have been obvious at least from his publication of *The Resurrection from the Dead*. It was this preoccupation with the triumphant grace of God manifested in the incarnation and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and in the new man risen from the dead, that gave Barth's naturally questioning mind the positive base from which to call in question the superficial fabric of the romantic-idealistic theology and to hasten its dissolution. It is the new wine that bursts the old bottles; it is because in Jesus Christ all things are made new that old things pass away; it is because the grace of God has overtaken us in Christ that all our efforts at philosophical and theological self-justification are revealed to be but shabby clothing beside the new humanity in the Risen Jesus. The criticism that emanated from this 'resurrection of the Resurrection' was utterly radical without being pessimist.

It might help here to draw a brief (and no doubt an exaggerated) comparison between Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr. As I see it, Niebuhr's return to the doctrine of man's depravity, so skilfully worked out later in his Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, was reached partly through disillusionment in and after the First World War and partly through the manifestation of the seamy side of human nature by modern psychological analysis. He began to understand again the wrath of God and the wicked pride of man, and he has come to paint for us a very black, and I feel a rather pessimistic, picture of human nature; and yet he did not go as far as to enunciate a doctrine of 'total depravity.' 'Total depravity' taught in those terms could only have been a sadistic slur upon the Creator—and Niebuhr is certainly not guilty of that. To Barth, however, this whole approach to human

nature is what he calls ' misanthropic and morbid.' He looks at human nature from the perspective of the death and resurrection of Christ for us. Because He died, because He rose again for us, not for some of us but for all of us, not for part of each of us but for the whole of each of us, we cannot but pass a ' total ' judgment upon man. If in Jesus Christ man is a new creature then the whole man comes under the sentence of the new creation : that is the most radical judgment possible, but at the same time it is not in the least pessimist, because the Resurrection is God's gracious affirmation of man. It is the confirmation of the fact that the man whom God created was good and remains good, but it is the revelation of the fact that fallen man has yielded his good nature to the service of sin and is wholly embroiled in it with all his natural goodness and his natural knowledge. Here, then, is the contrast : Niebuhr's rather anthropological and psychological approach to man's evil tends to lead him in the direction of a critical despair ; but Barth's insistence on looking at man from the perspective of the death and resurrection of Christ, while it enables him to speak radically of man's sin, leads him to speak joyfully and gratefully of the reaffirmation of man in the triumphant grace of God who receives and treats him as His child and as His friend. It is moreover from this perspective that Barth expounds the Creation and the whole history of God's covenant mercies toward man. The great cry against Barth after the publication of his *Commentary on Romans* was that he was a Marcionite, but in point of fact no one has ever been further removed from Marcion than Barth who insists that the covenant of grace realized in Jesus Christ is the inner ground and meaning of the Creation itself.

2. *Reconciliation and Election.* This is for Barth the very heart of the gospel, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. It is the glad tidings proclaimed to man in his sin, in spite of his rebellion and enmity, that God loves him and refuses to be alone without him, and insists on sharing with him His own life and glory. In fulfilment of that loving will God gave Himself to man under judgment and in his lost condition in order to redeem him out of perdition. The inconceivable extent of this love, according to Barth, is apparent from the fact that in so doing God hazarded and staked His own existence as God. It was love to the uttermost in which He took man's place under judgment in order to reclaim man and set him in His own place. It is characteristic of Barth's exposition of the Atonement, especially in the two parts of the fourth volume of the *Church Dogmatics*, that this is thought out in relation to the covenant of grace. It is in this way that Barth sets out the eternal basis of the Atonement. Certainly God has poured out His love to meet man's deepest need, so that where sin abounded grace did much more abound ; but Barth will not have it that atonement or reconciliation is a secondary and subsequent activity of the Divine will. On the other hand, he will have nothing to do with the Scotist speculation that the Incarnation would have happened anyway even if man had not fallen. The Divine election of grace manifested in the Covenant is made true and actual within history, for in atonement and reconciliation God realizes His eternal will with man. He keeps faith with Himself and with all men in Jesus Christ in a fulfilment of the Covenant which has the character of atonement and which eternally secures the restoration of a fellowship that was threatened with disruption and dissolution. Moreover the mutual relation of election and reconciliation in all this not only reveals the eternal basis of atonement but sets forth an account of election as the pure act of Divine love which is the rehabilitation of man as a human subject in perfect freedom and in the fulness of all his powers before God. ' The formula " god is everything and man is nothing " as a description of grace,' says Barth, ' is not merely a " shocking simplification " but complete nonsense.' In the giving of His Son, in reconciling the world to Himself in Christ, God is indeed everything, but only in order that man may *not* be nothing, in order that he may be everything that God has made him to be and means him to be as a human subject in relation to God, as His child and friend.

It is impossible in a few words to indicate anything of the immense power and richness of Barth's exposition of reconciliation. Although only two-thirds of it have yet been published, it is already evident that here we are given the greatest exposition of atonement that we have yet had in the whole history of dogma. That is not an enthusiastic exaggeration—it is difficult to see how any sincere reader of the *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, 4/1 and 4/2, can lay these volumes down without profound gratitude to God for this incomparable exposition of the overflowing grace of God to man in Jesus Christ.

3. *Jesus Christ, the Servant of the Lord.* To say election or to say atonement is to say the historical Jesus Christ. That is one of the sustained themes of Barth's Christology. Let it be said right away, to clear up any misunderstanding, that Barth is not afraid to rest his faith upon ' the weakness of God ' who in inconceivable humiliation and love has committed Himself to us in the historical Jesus. Everything in the gospel stands or falls with the historicity of the incarnation and life,

the crucifixion and resurrection, of Jesus Christ. 'To try and grasp it as supra-historical or non-historical truth is not to grasp it at all.' Barth will not, therefore, yield in the slightest to the existentialists' reinterpretation, in their fear and their flight from the hazards of history, to any programme that involves the de-humanizing of Jesus or the de-historicizing of the Incarnation. What Barth does do is to give a faithful account of the place of the historical humanity of Jesus in the whole gospel of reconciliation. His guiding conception here (in the tradition of Calvin) is that of the Servant and His obedience to the Father. We cannot do better than cite at this point Barth's own summary of this section of his work. 'That Jesus Christ is very God is shown in His way into the far country in which He the Lord became a servant. For in the majesty of the true God it happened that the eternal Son of the eternal Father became obedient by offering and humbling Himself to be the brother of man, to take His place with the transgressor, to judge him by judging Himself and dying in his place. But God the Father raised Him from the dead, and in so doing recognized and gave effect to His death and passion as a satisfaction made for us, as our conversion to God, and therefore as our redemption from death to life.'

At last the massive volumes of the *Church Dogmatics* have begun to appear in English, vol. 1. part 2 in May, while vol. iv. part 1, from which I have just cited, will appear in the autumn, published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark. Thereafter at least two volumes will appear each year. It is fitting that this edition of the *Church Dogmatics* in English should be launched in May, 1956, in honour of Karl Barth's seventieth birthday. Nothing could be more enriching for the whole Church than that he should be given the time and health to finish the great work God has given him to do.

Literature

SOMA SCRIPTURE

The Inspiration of Scripture: A Study of the Theology of the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmaticians, by the Rev. Robert Preus, Ph.D. (Oliver and Boyd; 20s. net), is a work of learning and immense interest for those prepared to brave an intricate argument. For too long an important and necessary period of Protestant development, the seventeenth century in Germany, has been dismissed as a period of barren polemic and arid scholasticism. At the same time, it has been only too plausibly suggested that in this period a Protestant Bibliolatry was rampant, not indeed 'fundamentalist' in the modern sense, but in effect far worse, since its involved arguments as to whether the Hebrew vowel points were inspired represent at best a fossilization of the original prophetic doctrine of the Word of God. Dr. Preus has done much to clear the reputation of these dogmatic Lutherans. He puts them in a proper historical perspective and does not let us forget for a moment that they were engaged on a war upon two fronts which partly conditioned, and certainly evoked, their theological emphases. Thus the abortive conference between Lutherans and Jesuits in 1601 led to a new and not altogether happy insistence on the fact that the Scripture is '*judex controversiarum*.' On the other hand, there was the attack on the Lutheran Syncretists, carried on with that acerbity which Lutherans seem to reserve for domestic quarrels, so that Hunnius could call the writings of Calixt and his friends 'the vehicle of Satan and of atheism'—on which Dr. Preus rather mildly comments 'here we see how very heated this controversy within the Lutheran church was!'

And beyond the Syncretists were the Socinians, who taught that Scripture might include errors, a horrific notion which led the dogmaticians to plug some of the remaining chinks in their circumvallation of Scripture with a really impregnable doctrine of inspiration. Dr. Preus states, and this is the main and deep value of this book, what the Lutheran dogmaticians have to say about the doctrine of inspiration, and let it be said that with all its blemishes, it is a discussion of the problems involved in the unity of Scripture and of a doctrine of inspiration far more profound than can be found in any contemporary discussion in Britain in the twentieth century. He shows that, at every point where we impeach them of crudity, there is in fact an awareness of the deep issues at stake. Their distinction between the twofold form and the twofold matter of Scripture allows for a good deal more flexibility in the doctrine of inspiration than we might expect. Their doctrine of a plenary, verbal inspiration of Scripture is to be balanced by a doctrine of accommodation which makes due allowance for the human character and environment of the Scriptural writers; and even the celebrated dilemma of the 'vowel points' is shown in its context to be a not unreasonable controversy. Of course Dr. Preus does not altogether convince; he leans over backwards in his attempt to show that here is no docetism, no Montanism, that the

inspired writers, though they are simply instruments of the Spirit who jogs their elbows and whispers them in the ear, are not depersonalized in the process. But surely the refusal of these writers to admit that the Scriptures can contain barbarisms and solecisms is a revealing point, and here is in fact an attitude to Scripture which is docetic and even Gnostic, which has, as Dr. Preus admits, thought of revelation as conveyed in words rather than in deeds. The doctrine of the Witness of the Spirit, in particular, is too closely tied to the written Scriptures, and the early flexibility of the first generations of Protestantism, the conjunction of the Word and Spirit in Luther, and even the fruitful controversy over the relation between Outward and Inner word, these had a depth and richness which has long since dried up among these new controversies. Still, we could do with a touch of this Protestant scholasticism in our age which has produced only one great Schoolman (Karl Barth). And if one believes that much of this is further from Luther than Dr. Preus would admit, certainly the principle of the Bible, the Bible only as the religion of Protestants, has rarely been taken in more deadly (!) earnest. It is a misfortune that there is no index in a work which readers will want often to turn to for quotations not easily available elsewhere. And sometimes Dr. Preus produces a turn of phrase, and words hitherto unknown in the English language. But this is an important and exhilarating work.

GORDON RUPP

ASPECTS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

A new series of religious books, called the 'Christian Faith' series and written for the intelligent general reader, has just begun to appear. It is intended to analyze various aspects of the Christian faith which have been neglected in the effort to make it conform to the presuppositions of modern man. The consulting editor is Professor Reinhold Niebuhr and the authors are men holding religious teaching posts in America; but the series is published in this country by Messrs. Victor Gollancz and the two volumes so far issued are priced at 12s. 6d. net.

The first volume, *The Renewal of Man*, by Professor Alexander Miller, Stanford University, is described as a twentieth-century essay on Justification by Faith. It is brightly written and is full of revealing insights expressed in memorable language and firmly based both on Christian doctrine and on real experience of life. One or two doubts suggest themselves. Surely it was not Matthew Arnold who defined religion as what a man does with his solitariness? (p. 166). Is the idea of natural law tied to the realm of the rational? (p. 97). May not the compassion which makes men revolt from the thought of torture and honour the practice of self-sacrifice be the reflection in man of the natural law, even though it may be hard to give a rational justification for it? The conclusion of the chapter on the Ethics of Justification is a little casual about moral decision and sounds perilously like saying that, since we need to be forgiven anyway, we may as well be forgiven for a sheep as a goat! Nevertheless, this is a really helpful book.

The second volume, *Man's Knowledge of God*, by Professor William J. Wolf of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, is a study of God's revelation of Himself in history. The unique element in Christianity among the religions of the world is the belief that a decisive and final revelation has happened in Christ and that the eternal Christ can become contemporary for His people in revelatory experience. Revelation, however, is a term liable to misconception, and what has become the centre of revelation for Christians—a revelation both continuous and discontinuous with that in the Old Testament—needs for its understanding to be brought into relation not only to Scripture but also to history, faith, reason, the Church, and to the knowledge of God in other religions. This task Professor Wolf has essayed with much success and by the way has touched on most of the topics of theology, showing that the revelation was given in Christ in such a manner that it can and must be appropriated anew in the Christian Community. This is an essay which will repay study.

We look forward to succeeding volumes in this promising series.

STEWART MECHIE

WESLEYANA

It might seem incredible, on the face of it, that any one could write a life of John Wesley in 1956 that is at once new, true, and interesting. Yet Dr. Umphrey Lee, Chancellor of Southern Methodist University, U.S.A., has done all this in *The Lord's Horseman* (Hodder and Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net). The story follows the familiar route from the Lincoln fens to the graveyard in City Road, but the telling of it has a less familiar sparkle. The pages are salted with American idiom, pleasant and never obtrusive, and lit up with flashes of wit, pointed and always appropriate. From them Wesley stands out as a man of his own time, 'warts and all,' his errors of judgment and weakness not concealed; but a man of God whose great deeds and influence on history seem wholly credible. The 'Journal' has been used with great skill, and the events set firmly in the context of contemporary history. The

book is worthy of its theme and adds to the author's already considerable reputation.

On his last page Dr. Lee raises the question as to what Wesley would have thought and said of the works of his successors. The answer is implied in Dr. Franz Hildebrandt's Rall Lectures—*Christianity according to the Wesleys* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net)—in which a distinguished Lutheran, now a Methodist minister, lets Wesley 'speak freely for himself, even where he speaks against modern Methodism.' The Christianity of the Wesleys (and the author rightly refuses to discriminate between the Sermons and Notes of John and the Hymns of Charles) is gathered under four heads: Scriptural, Practical, Missionary, Catholic. Each aspect is treated succinctly and fundamentally, demonstrating that Dr. Hildebrandt has read more widely and thought more deeply in a few years than many of his colleagues in a lifetime. Every page is marked by clarity, understanding, and conviction. The author is in the best of company when he makes his own contribution a running commentary on his well-selected quotations from the Hymns and Works of the Wesleys. It would be hard to envisage a more adequate account within the compass of eighty pages than that given here.

In the final chapter, Dr. Hildebrandt relates the discussion of the Wesleys' catholicity to the current conversations between Anglicans and Methodists. There can be no doubt that his strictures and warnings call for serious consideration. Yet we may ask whether Dr. Hildebrandt has considered the possibility that the elements in the Anglican tradition which he subjects to such radical criticism represent as precious a heritage to that communion of the *Una Sancta* as do these, which he has here so convincingly set out, to his own communion.

MARCUS WARD

DANIEL

Canon E. W. Heaton has written a most attractive and useful commentary on *The Book of Daniel* in 'The Torch Bible Commentaries' (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net). The Introduction, to which nearly one hundred pages are given, interprets the author of the Book and its hero from two points of view. The author, a scribe who may well have belonged to the circle of Chasidim, and his Book are not merely the forerunner and classic exemplar of the Apocalyptic Literature, for such a view inclines to leave chs. 1–6 out of account, but must also be interpreted in the light of Wisdom and Apocryphal traditions so characteristic of the life and thought of his day.

Canon Heaton is disinclined to accept the unity of the Book as coming from one author. He regards ch. 7 as the key and creative centre of the Book. Chapters 8–12 are then a further commentary added by a later hand in face of different circumstances. At the same time the Book must be understood as a whole, for the second part has grown out of the first part. The Introduction also includes a sane account of the historical setting and religious significance of the Book in reference to the Seleucid crisis.

The Commentary of nearly a hundred and forty pages is equally rewarding and indeed fascinating. The unity of the parabolic stories and dream visions of chs. 1–7 is found in the theme of the true Israel, of whom the sage, Daniel, often portrayed after the likeness of Joseph, is the embodiment and ideal expression. The Son of Man in ch. 7 is the crown of this theme, and the explanation of 7^{14} is, I think, the right one. The expansion found in chs. 8–12 belongs to the years of the crisis, and are thus concerned with the question: When will the persecution end? The last three chapters are rightly taken as a unity, but chs. 8–12 as a whole are less significant for Biblical theology. The Commentary throughout is lively, laced with copious and apposite references, and passages relevant to our own day are not overlooked.

Canon Heaton and the S.C.M. Press are to be heartily congratulated on this longer and illuminating 'Torch.'

G. HENTON DAVIES

Over one thousand, to be accurate one thousand and one, illustrations are collected in *Speakers' Illustrations for Special Days*, edited by Professor Charles L. Wallis and published by the Abingdon Press ($3.50). One of the great difficulties about illustrations is how to find them. Here a very good cross-index of subjects has been provided. The illustrations are arranged by days and seasons, such as New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Lent and Easter, Festival of the Christian Home, Independence Day (for this is an American book). Some of the illustrations seem rather well known, but, picking out somewhat at random, here is one we like. It is taken from E. Stanley Jones' *How to Be a Transformed Person*: 'A little fellow was sweating as he carried a large stone across the yard. "Why don't you use all your strength?" asked his father. The little fellow felt hurt and said, "Daddy, I am." And the father replied, "You haven't asked me to help you." There stood his resources in the person of the father, but uncalled on.'

Thomas Carlyle, who said, 'It is as toilsome reading as I ever undertook,' has expressed the feelings of many who have attempted to read the

Koran. One is therefore glad to find that at last a translation has been published which makes a new appreciation possible. It is *The Koran Interpreted*, 2 vols., by Professor A. J. Arberry, Litt.D., F.B.A. (Allen and Unwin; 45s. net). In the Preface he claims to be breaking new ground, as he holds that 'in no previous rendering has a serious attempt been made to imitate, however imperfectly, those rhetorical and rhythmical patterns which are the glory and the sublimity of the Koran.' In his earlier book, 'The Holy Koran,' Professor Arberry indicated how certain rhythmic patterns are characteristic of the Koran, and in this translation, or interpretation, as he prefers to call it, varies the rhythm to show something of the style of the original. The verses in the Koran are rhymed, but to attempt this in an English translation would give an appearance of artificiality, so instead of using rhyme, he commonly ends the verses with a shorter line. In his presentation he has been remarkably successful. Not only is it, as one would expect, an accurate translation; it is characterised by great felicity of expression. To present the long suras which have commonly seemed so dreary in other translations in a manner which it is a pleasure to read is no small accomplishment. He has left the Koran to speak for itself. He has a very interesting introduction, but indulges in no criticism, and provides no notes, as those who want them can find them elsewhere. If we use English Bibles without notes, why should an English Koran not appear in similar form? English readers have reason to be grateful for this beautiful version of the Koran.

Professor Arberry holds that each sura is an artistic whole, which makes one wonder who was responsible for this. Some Muslims hold that Muhammad arranged the suras himself in their present form, but the well-known tradition of the compilation of the Koran says that it was collected after the Prophet's death from a variety of sources. Would Professor Arberry hold that Muhammad himself is responsible for the artistic arrangement, or have we to thank those who collected it after his death?

Who Knows Better Must Say So is a timely and illuminating publication of the American Council for Judaism, New York, priced at 50 cents. It consists of letters written during a seven and a half weeks' tour in the Middle East by Dr. Elmer Berger, Executive Director of the Council. On a day in which he visited Arab refugee camps he confesses to being ashamed of being a Jew. Again, he reports that the Arab countries are not backward and decadent, but that they can show enormous internal development. Most important, however, is his conviction that the real foe of peace in the Middle East is Zionism. He returned to America firmly convinced that there is hope of peaceful negotiation of outstanding issues if the Arab countries are convinced that the other party is just another state in that area, prepared to share the lot and contribute to the progress of the whole area on a basis of mutual respect. What they will not negotiate with is a political entity which regards itself, and is regarded by Jews generally, as the vanguard in Palestine of a Zionist empire. The core of the problem, as he sees it, is the attitude of American Jews, for it is their support that keeps up the unreasonable pretensions of the state of Israel.

The Berean Press has republished a devotional manual first published by another house fourteen years ago—*A Companion to the Communion Service*, by Dr. William Robinson of Butler University, Indianapolis. This little book is to be welcomed not only for its excellences but because it is one of the small number of devotional books based on the Reformed tradition of Holy Communion. Besides an explanation of the service it includes prayers for use before and after the service and also extracts from the teaching on the Lord's Supper of Reformed divines from Calvin to P. T. Forsyth. The price is 5s. net.

The Methodist Lent Book for this year was *They Met at Calvary*, by the Rev. W. E. Sangster, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). Like many another preacher the author takes up in successive chapters the persons and groups who crucified Jesus, and shows how their case speaks to modern conditions. Less usual is the chapter on the people who ministered to Him, and the final one which seeks to meet the difficulties of those who cannot see the contemporary and personal reference of the Cross. This is a model of Biblical, searching and well-illustrated preaching.

The Rev. Cyril Taylor's *The Way to Heaven's Door* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net) consists of twenty-four talks on tunes to which favourite hymns are sung. They are illustrated by the necessary musical examples. Originally these talks were given in the 'Light Programme' with a choir and soloist. We hope they will be heard again and the tunes played and sung soon. Surely there is a fine opportunity here for a church choir.

Messages from the Parables, by the Rev. Carl A. Glover (Independent Press; 8s. 6d. net), is a useful addition to the literature on the parables. Mr. Glover's work is thoroughly up-to-date with the latest work done on the parables; but this is not a

technical book; it is a preacher's and a teacher's book.

Mr. Glover divides the parables into five sections —The Portrait of the King, The Unfolding of the Kingdom, The Demands of the Kingdom, Aliens to the Kingdom, Citizens of the Kingdom. He has certain very interesting groupings of the parables. He groups together the Parable of the Patched Garment, the Parable of New Wine and Old Wineskins, The Parable of Wheat and Weeds, and summarises their teaching in this way: 'Jesus showed that patchwork religious thinking is inconsistent with wholeness of living, that an out-worn religious system is an inadequate container for new and vital ideas, and that hasty action against evil may be misguided folly.' In the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus he finds the following possible lessons: the survival of personality, the levelling up process of divine justice, the fixation of destiny, which after death cannot be changed, a clear-cut warning against inhumanity.

He quotes Charles R. Brown's summary of the Parable of the Good Samaritan. 'The robbers said, "What's yours is ours; we'll take it." The priest and the Levite said, "What's ours is ours; we'll keep it." The Samaritan said, "What's mine is yours; we'll share it."'

In this book the resources of scholarship are unobtrusively laid under tribute for the benefit of the preacher and the teacher, who will be very grateful for the freshness of this book.

St. Maximus the Confessor: The Ascetic Life, The Four Centuries on Charity, translated and annotated by Professor Polycarp Sherwood, O.S.B., S.T.D. (published in America by the Newman Press and in this country by Longmans, Green and Co.; 25s. net; 20s. if a standing order for the series is placed), is the latest volume in the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series. It is a most useful volume, for these works are not otherwise obtainable in English. There is a most learned introduction, and adequate notes. In his Introduction to the Four Centuries, Maximus has a conclusion which would disarm any ancient reviewer: 'Perhaps something useful for the soul will come out of them; but this will wholly come from God's grace to him who reads with a simple mind, with the fear of God, and with charity. But for him who takes up this or any other work whatsoever, not for the sake of spiritual profit but of ferreting out phrases to revile the author, while setting up his own conceited self as wiser, there will never come any profit of any sort.' Each of the Four Centuries consists of a hundred brief sayings about charity, many of which are summaries of the teachings of the Fathers. 'He that keeps his body apart from pleasure and disease has it as a fellow helper in the service of better things.' 'Vice is the mistaken judgment of our ideas, upon which follows the misuse of things.' 'He is a man of power that has joined knowledge to action; for by the one he makes concupiscences wither and tames anger; with the other he gives wings to the mind, and departs to God.' 'Practically every sin is committed for pleasure.' 'Do not misuse thoughts lest you be forced to misuse things too. For unless a man first sin in thought, he will never sin in deed.' 'A pure mind sees things rightly; a practised speech places them in evidence; a keen hearing accepts them.' 'With everything misuse is sin.'

It is good to have these works of Maximus. This volume amply upholds the high standard of this most valuable series.

The purpose of this book—*The Biblical Doctrine of Justice and Law*, by Heinz-Horst Schrey, Hans Hermann Walz, and W A. Whitehouse (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), published by the Division of Studies of the World Council of Churches—is to discover from the Bible the foundation of that Justice to which all men, either naïvely or learnedly, at some time or other appeal, and a tension at once is revealed between the peace established by Law and that peace which cannot be given by Law. Sometimes the learned—perhaps over-learned—writers sacrifice lucidity to depth, but in the depths they certainly discover valuable treasure, and their attitude throughout is broad-minded. They give us a careful treatment of the Old Testament conception of Law as based on the righteousness of God and its culmination in the New Testament, in which the work of Christ is set forth as the climax of the righteousness of God and where righteousness also is recognized as not exclusive but universal in its scope.

Twin dangers are clearly kept in view—on the one hand, of deducing from the Bible a stereotyped system, as St. Thomas Aquinas tended to do, and, on the other hand, of pietistic aloofness from any religious concern with the actual systems of Law. The general counsel of the book is that there must be no facile transference of laws (however sacrosanct) suited to one condition to other conditions wholly different; that the so-called 'natural law' is neither inimical to nor adequate for a Christian attitude to present actual conditions; and that regard must always be had to the consideration that our present experience does not constitute a closed system outside of the influence of the eschatological element which Christianity constantly emphasizes. In other words we must constantly be brought back to confront the distinction between the peace of the Law and the peace which the world cannot give.

Bultmann and the Liberal Theology—I

By the Reverend Geraint Vaughan Jones, M.A., B.Litt., Glasgow

I

Bultmann has been frequently described as being in the tradition of the so-called liberal theology. Thus to E. Stauffer he is 'the heir of the tradition of the old liberal school and also its radical executor.'[1] Principal J. Vernon Lewis also considers him because of his critical work to belong to the liberal tradition, particularly in his influence on Form-Criticism, though on the other hand he stands in the evangelical-Lutheran tradition through his emphasis on justification by faith and on the centrality of the Cross. 'He is therefore,' says Principal Lewis, 'a union of or a link between liberalism and orthodoxy.'[2] Fritz Buri, while according due recognition to Bultmann's masterly existential interpretation of the New Testament, asks whether he is not doing precisely that with which he reproaches liberal theologians by dissolving the gospel into a general 'human possibility,' not in terms of idealism, but of existentialism.[3] Professor H. de Vos, in his comprehensive study of Bultmann's theology, maintains that his vigorous criticism of the liberal theology may even be the sign of a bad conscience, which he has, in any case, reason to have in view of the fact that he stands closer to this theology than he is willing to acknowledge[4]; and L. Malevez, S.J., in what is perhaps the most adequate as well as a sympathetic exposition and criticism of the existentialist demything of the New Testament, concludes that Bultmann has sought to occupy a position half way between faith and rationalism, between the theology of revelation and the liberal theology: an illusory undertaking which can lead only to Liberalism.[5] There is some agreement, therefore, that Bultmann, whatever his protestations, stands in a positive relationship to the liberal theology. The character of this relationship is not merely an academic question but a kind of fixed point which will be of assistance in assessing his theological position as a whole, and in providing a standard whereby the liberal and post-liberal theologies may be judged. We shall therefore attend to what Bultmann himself has said about the liberal theology before passing to a definition of it and to the question of his positive relationship to it.

II

For our present purpose a distinction will be drawn at the outset between the general temper of Bultmann's theology and his radically negative conclusions as a New Testament critic; for while, on the one hand, his *Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* [1921] and *Jesus* [1929] showed that he considered doomed to failure any attempt to recover the 'historical Jesus' or to form any authentic picture of Him as a historical personality, on the other he has given special prominence to the theology of revelation which he claims to overrule all 'historical' analysis, though the medium of revelation is, of course, a historical person. Indeed, the crux of his judgment on the liberal theologians is found in his attitude towards the question of the relation of the 'historical' to the Christian revelation, and in an earlier essay entitled 'The Liberal Theology and the latest Movement in Theology' [1924] he criticized the errors of this theology as represented by Harnack and Troeltsch, for reasons which have been advanced by Barth and Brunner and other post-liberal theologians for rejecting Liberalism as a system; and as Bultmann's thinking exhibits a consistent pattern his earlier writings still remain the key to an appreciation of his present position.

In this essay Bultmann acknowledges with gratitude his debt to the liberating influence of the liberal theology, without which he, and others like him, would not have become theologians at all, for the orthodox university theology of the time appeared to him to be nothing more than an unsuccessful effort at compromise.[6] To the liberal

[1] *Kerygma und Mythos*, ii. [1952], 22. '*Bultmann ist der Erbe der alten liberalistischen Schultradition und ihr radikaler Testamentvollstrecker.*'

[2] *Diwinyddiaeth Heddiw a Phregethu* (*The Theology of To-day and Preaching*) [1954], 16. '*Y mae felly yn gyfuniad neu'n ddolen gydiol rhwng Rhyddfrydiaeth ac uniongrededd.*'

[3] *Kerygma und Mythos*, ii. 89.

[4] *Nieuwe Testament en Mythe: het Vraagstuk der Ontmythologisering* [1953], 41. '*De krasse taal kan ook op een slecht geweten wijzen. Bultmann heeft in elk geval reden, een dergelijk geweten te hebben; hij staat dichter bij de bestreden theologie, dan hij erkennen wil.*'

[5] *Le Message Chrétien et le Mythe: la Théologie de Rudolf Bultmann* [1954], 162. '*Bultmann a cherché une position moyenne entre la foi et le rationalisme, entre la théologie de la révélation et la théologie liberale. Entreprise illusoire. Sur la voie où il s'est engagé, seul le libéralisme est possible. . . .*' Cf. references by D. Nineham, The Expository Times, lxvi. [Oct. 1954], 16 f. and J. Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology* [1955], 236.

[6] *Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 2.

theology he owed his critical training; nevertheless, the historicism resulting from its predominantly historical interest led to the formulation of erroneous results, for its methods could lead only to conclusions of relative validity. The Harnack-Troeltsch type of thought, in Bultmann's view, was on a completely false track because it represented Christianity as a 'this-worldly (*innerweltlich*) phenomenon subject to social and psychological laws.' Christologically the picture of Jesus which they produced was, together with the one offered by the Leben-Jesu writers, purely imaginary, humanistic, and undistinguished. History was considered to be an immanental process expressing spiritual forces and natural powers as the setting for the evolutionary emergence of Christianity, whereas the eternal, not historical newness, is the category of Divine operation. Further, Christianity had come to be thought of as the vocational sphere of service to God: a questionable notion, for God is the '*schlechthin Jenseitige*,' the wholly transcendent, who is not to be encountered in an immanently or socially conceived Kingdom, or in the performance of our civil occupation. All attempts to make of the Christian faith an ideal of human conduct ignores the essential *skandalon* of the gospel. The Cross has nothing to do with the idea of stimulating one to sacrifice in the moral sense of self-denial in the service of developing personality. It is the Word, the Revelation, the summons. Hence Bultmann takes Johannes Weiss to task for presenting the gospel in a manner which is almost indistinguishable from Stoicism at its best, and Jesus as an 'example,' which shows how far he is from realizing the essentially 'decisive' character of the gospel.

Further evidence of this line of thought is to be found in an essay dealing with Christology written as a discussion of Emmanuel Hirsch's *Jesus der Herr*.[1] Christianity, says Bultmann, does not consist of 'general truth'; faith is not a 'numinous quality' but the acceptance of revelation.[2] Jesus is the Word of Revelation, and to speak theologically about Him is to speak of Him as He is visible to faith and to faith alone (that is, not 'historically'). Hirsch's error is in thinking of Jesus as *Χριστός κατὰ σάρκα*; indeed, it seems that, in Bultmann's view, there can be no error greater than this, and Hirsch falls into it through his presentation of Jesus as a 'historian's reconstruction' in psychological terms. Here Jesus is seen not through faith but through rationalism and pietism, and faith virtually abdicates when we allow Jesus to speak to us through the gospel narrative as a 'historical' person. 'The historical Jesus neither demands anything from us directly nor does He judge us for the act which we have committed against Him.' In the liberal theology Jesus confronts us as a 'Thou' from the past who can do no more than present us with a moral demand. Hirsch, in his attempt to make the Cross 'impressive,' has missed the point, for this is the mark of an 'obsolete Leben-Jesu theology.' Indeed, it would seem that any kind of Christological speculation about the 'inner relationship between the Word and its bearer' is irrelevant to the demand of the Word itself.[3] The Christ 'according to the flesh' does not concern us, for He belongs to the '*Phantasiebilder*,' the imaginative pictures, of the Leben-Jesu theology. Hermann, too, comes under similar condemnation, for his 'inner life of Jesus' and 'impressiveness of the Person of Jesus who saves' type of theology Bultmann rejects out of hand. He will have none of it. His whole emphasis, as is revealed in his *Jesus*, for example, is on the summons to existential decision.

Bultmann's later preoccupation with the notions of the 'historic' and the 'historical' (*geschichtlich* and *historisch*) and with Heidegger's terms *Dasein* ('existence') and *Vorhandenheit* ('just being there') appears in his essay on 'The Question of Miracle.'[4] Miracle, he says, is a conception which has to be opposed partly because (as for the liberal theologian) it has become impossible for us to-day as an infraction of natural law and as an interruption of the regularity of Nature, but also because Jesus' miracles (if they are thought of as having occurred) were 'past events.' 'The temptation is always present to turn the present *Dasein* into a past *Vorhandensein*.'[5] That is to say, we confine the 'historic' act of forgiveness through grace in Jesus Christ, which is the real miracle, within the rigid clothing of a historical occurrence which is done with. A verifiable miracle would not support faith, and the idea of miracles as evidential (another typical liberal-modernist objection) is to be rejected. Miracle in any case belongs to the mythical world-view and therefore cannot be fitted into a rational system. It has no Christological significance.

A similar kind of anti-historical approach appears in Bultmann's essay entitled 'The Significance of the Historical Jesus for Paul's Theology.' It is clear, Bultmann observes, that the actual words of Jesus cannot be invoked in support of Paul's theological, anthropological, and soteriological views. Moreover, Christology is not a theoretical affair but the explication of the 'answer of decision.'[6] Indeed, Jesus did not indulge in teaching about His own Person, nor did He expound a new idea of God, a new morality, or a new *Weltanschauung*; nor did Paul regard Jesus as an 'example' or as a hero, or show any reverence for

[1] *Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 85–113.
[2] *Ib.*, 89.
[3] *Ib.*, 100. [4] *Ib.*, 214 ff. [5] *Ib.*, 228. [6] *Ib.*, 204 f.

Him as a 'historical' personality. For the *Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα* Paul has no use whatever. This may be good Paulinism or not; it is certainly good Bultmannism, Paul or no Paul. Where, then, does Jesus 'meet' us? Not as a 'historical' person, but in the preaching. 'Jesus Christ encounters man nowhere but in the kerygma': a statement which Bultmann repeated in the essay on demythologizing.[1] We should, therefore, not go behind the kerygma, any more than Paul went behind his 'encounter' on the road to Damascus to the 'historical' Jesus, in search of a 'source' or to find the historical Jesus with His 'Messianic consciousness,' His 'inner life,' or to reconstruct a historical figure who would be merely Christ 'after the flesh,' a mere figure belonging to the past. 'Not the historical Jesus but Jesus Christ as He was preached is Lord.'[2]

It is clear, therefore, that Bultmann rejects root and branch anything that savours of historicism. 'If we are to perceive the real meaning of the Cross,' he asks in the essay on demythologizing, 'must we understand it as the cross of Jesus as a figure of past history? *Must we go back to the Jesus of history?*' And in his reply to Schniewind,[3] he says that far from running away from history to take refuge in *Geschichte* he is 'deliberately renouncing any form of encounter with a phenomenon of past history,' including one with Christ 'after the flesh,' in order to encounter the Christ preached in the kerygma. No wonder that A. N. Wilder observed that Bultmann puts historical study 'out of court.'[4] History and *Geschichte*, the historical and the historic, appear to be irreconcilable antitheses. Neither history nor Nature, he indicates in his essay on 'The Question of Natural Revelation' [1941],[5] is to be regarded as a field of revelation, a point of view which again separates Bultmann from the liberals, whose 'historical pantheism' (*Geschichtspantheismus*) he had earlier [1924] found unacceptable.

In this matter of the 'historical Jesus,' then, Bultmann shows himself to be radically opposed to one aspect, at least, of the liberal theology as he understands it, and in his reluctance to employ the term 'Incarnation' and to apply metaphysics to Christology, as well as in his substitution of a term such as 'Christ-event,' he is evading the issue which has been the concern of Christian theology since its beginning and especially of the liberal theologians in their attempts to 'modernize' Christology. Together with Barth, Brunner, and other post-liberal theologians, his emphasis on 'revelation' and the factor of 'encounter' represents a marked difference of mood from that which characterized the liberal theology, whether German or British. His treatment of the teaching of Jesus in his *Theology of the New Testament*, which he considers to deserve no more than some thirty pages, shows what an insignificant position he assigns to the kerygma of the 'Founder' of Christianity who is the subject of the apostolic kerygma to which he gives such prominence. All that is necessary in order to understand Jesus as the eschatological phenomenon, as the Saviour 'through whom God delivered the world by passing judgment on it,' is to 'proclaim that he has come.'[6] Indeed, if we wish to imitate the jargon of current theology, we might invent a term such as *die Enthistorisierung des Kerygmas* as descriptive of Bultmann's consistent emphasis.

A further point at issue between Bultmann and the liberal theology as he understands it lies in the contrast between his own somewhat pessimistic interpretation of the human predicament and the optimism which is characteristic of the humanist tendency in the liberal theology.[7] In this connexion he observes that, whereas God is the proper subject of theology, the liberal theologians should be rebuked because they deal 'not with God but with man,'[8] in saying which he is in agreement with Barth and Brunner, though at the same time misrepresenting Liberalism, as, in Dr. de Vos' opinion, he is inclined to do.[9]

Another of the main differences between Bultmann and the liberal theologians which emerges from his criticisms of them is his indifference to the crucial question of Christology; indeed, we cannot avoid concluding that for him any such concern is a kind of theological will-o'-the-wisp and cannot lead to any useful results. Only on one occasion does he actually deal directly with Christology as generally understood, and even then hardly conclusively, unless the dismissal of a question is to be regarded as conclusive.[10]

[1] *Kerygma and Myth*, 41; cf. *Der Begriff der Offenbarung im N.T.* [1929], 40; and *Glauben und Verstehen*, ii. 257, 259, where Bultmann speaks of the historical person of Jesus as the eschatological event *proclaimed in the word of preaching*; cf. also *Theology of the New Testament*, 302 f., 305.

[2] *Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 208.

[3] *Kerygma and Myth*, 117.

[4] *Journal of Biblical Literature* [1950], 123.

[5] *Glauben und Verstehen*, ii. 79–104.

[6] *Kerygma and Myth*, 118.

[7] Cf. the essay on 'Humanism and Christianity,' in *ib.*, 135.

[8] *Glauben und Verstehen*, i. 2.

[9] *Nieuwe Testament en Mythe*, 41.

[10] In the essay on 'The Christological Confession of the Ecumenical Council' (*Glauben und Verstehen*, ii. 246 ff.) Bultmann considers that the confessional basis of the W.C.C. should have included some formula such as 'Jesus as the Word of God' rather than 'as God,' for the New Testament sanction for the latter is questionable (p. 258).

On the other hand, his continuous emphasis on Christ the Word of Revelation, addressing man decisively in the here and now of his existential situation and on the need to emancipate faith ' from its association with a world-view expressed in objective terms,' is a necessary corrective to the over-humanistic evolutionary Christology of many liberal theologians which has tended to reduce the absolute demands not of the Pauline kerygmatic presentation of the gospel but of the kerygma of Jesus Himself, the authenticity of which Bultmann concedes only when it is ' eschatological ' and ' existential ' in its challenge.

Bultmann further considers that one major difference between himself and the ' older liberal theologians ' consists in their respective attitudes towards demything and its effect upon the kerygma. The liberals, in his view, discarded the mythological elements in the New Testament as no longer compatible with the modern view of the world ; but whereas they desired to eliminate the mythological, Bultmann considers it the task of the New Testament theologian to use criticism in order to interpret it, ' though, of course, it may be necessary to eliminate it here and there.[1] The criterion to be adopted, however, should not be drawn from ' modern thought ' but from the ' understanding of human existence which the New Testament enshrines.'

Now the liberals, in Bultmann's opinion, erred not so much in their treatment of ' myth ' but in so diluting the kerygma as to reduce the gospel to ' a few basic principles of religion and ethics.' They so to speak threw out the kerygmatic baby with the mythological bathwater. Christianity was no longer the proclamation of the ' decisive act of God in Christ ' but a collection of ' timeless and eternal ' truths. Like the *Religionsgeschichtler* the liberals were ' silent ' about the decisive act proclaimed ' as the event of redemption.' In other words, it seems that Bultmann is accusing the liberal theology of a lack of evangelical understanding of the absoluteness and finality of the gospel, chiefly because they approached it from the human end of subjective faith. In this Bultmann shares, in the main, the attitude of the ' theology of crisis ' towards the liberal theology. Brunner, for example, describes Schleiermacher's emphasis on feeling as a ' hyper-æsthetic impressionism of experience ' (*hyperästhetischer Erlebnisimpressionismus*),[2] and for Barth liberal Protestantism is merely a form of what he calls *Religionismus*[3] and Reinhold Seeberg's *Christliche Dogmatik* [1925] (perhaps the last attempt of the liberal theology to produce a full scale Dogmatics) as a philosophy of religion rather than a genuine *Dogmatik*. Indeed, the ' human lustre ' (*humane Glanz*) of the liberal theology has, for Barth, found completion in Harnack and Troeltsch ; the philosopher of religion has become its historian and finally its psychologist.[4] The logical result of all this, in Barth's view, is the American type of preaching with its concentration on ' religious topics.' Liberalism, again (and Bultmann would agree with this) does not take the Word of God seriously enough,[5] and Brunner, too, rejects all historicism and ' the influence of Jesus on the history of the world ' and so on,[6] for any scheme which seeks to fit Jesus into a pattern of historical-evolutionary development is to be condemned. What the Bible proclaims is ' not a continuous growth on the horizontal plane of history but a vertical disruption of the historical process by forces interposed from beneath or above.' [7] Similar judgments have been passed by Dr. L. S. Thornton on the ' liberal experiment,' which erred in seeking to extract the kernel from the husk and to achieve a compromise between orthodoxy and modern philosophy. ' It was simply the theological counterpart of that secular humanism which is still the tortured soul of our modern world.' [8] The evolutionary Christ, he maintains, is the opposite of the ' form of a servant.'

With judgments such as these Bultmann, it is clear from what he has written about the liberal theology, would be in agreement. To this extent he represents the reaction against theological Liberalism, at any rate in some of its manifestations. This, however, is not the whole truth about Bultmann ; we have yet to consider his affinities with the school of theology which he apparently rejects and to inquire how far the opinions cited on his positive relation to Liberalism are justified.

---

[1] *Kerygma and Myth*, 12.

[2] *Die Mystik und das Wort* [1924], 52.

[3] *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, I. ii. 316. Seeberg's treatment of the Incarnation, for example (*Christliche Dogmatik*, ii. § 31) belongs to a different kind of world from the post-liberal theology.

[4] *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, I. i. 267.

[5] *Ib.*, I. ii. 205.

[6] *The Mediator*, 81. See pp. 42–101, 153–200, 249 ff. for a full statement of Brunner's criticism of the liberal theology.

[7] *The Theology of Crisis*, 104.

[8] *Revelation and the Modern World*, 108. Cf. also Edwin Lewis, *A Christian Manifesto* [1934] and his criticism of Modernism (which are applicable to Liberalism in general, though he distinguishes between the two, in *A Philosophy of Christian Revelation* [1948].

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Self Barrier

By the Reverend Alestair Bennett, M.A., Glasgow

'And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved; for he had great possessions.'—Mk 10[22].

It is a sad story, the story of the rich young ruler. He so nearly became a follower of Jesus, but not quite. What stopped him? It was the self barrier that stopped him, he could not forget himself and all his riches. He could not say, 'I don't matter, it is Jesus that matters most, I must follow Him.' He could not pass the self barrier.

What is the self barrier? What made me think of the self barrier was a photograph which I saw in the newspaper some time ago, a photograph of an aeroplane which had several times passed the sound barrier. I am sure all the boys know what the sound barrier is; probably you could tell me things about it that I do not know. But so far as my knowledge goes, the sound barrier is not a barrier you can see. The sound barrier is a resistance that an aeroplane meets when it is travelling at seven hundred and sixty miles per hour, nearly thirteen miles each minute. It seems that when an aeroplane reaches this tremendous speed the air appears to hold it back, won't let it go any faster, it is only the most powerful and the best designed aeroplanes that can push through this resistance and go on to higher speeds. But when they do get through the sound barrier they find that they can go very smoothly, the barrier is there but when you have passed it, flight is smooth again.

The self barrier is very like the sound barrier. As we go through life we find that many people can go along very well and attain quite high standards of goodness and kindness, but there is a point where they come up against very great resistance and if they do not overcome this resistance then they can never pass to the best way. They can never pass to the way that is like Jesus. And the barrier that marks the stopping place for so many people is the self barrier, they just cannot give up being selfish. I hope you are not one of the boys and girls who promise so well, and people feel sure you will do much good in life, and then there is disappointment, you stick, you come up against the self barrier and you never find enough power to pass it. I hope you will be like the very modern aeroplanes in which we are all so interested; that as they reach and pass the sound barrier so you will reach and pass the self barrier and pass on to be Christ's true disciple in the highest ranges of His service.

Simply Stupid

By the Reverend Frank Foxon, Coventry

'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?'—Lk 6[46].

I could hear the noise long before the cause of it came into view. The Park, during warm summer holidays, is never a quiet place. But this was not just happy children shouting at play. It sounded much more like a minor war. What could the game be, I wondered? Cow-boys against Indians? Earthmen against Spacemen? Once round the corner and the mystery would be cleared up. It was.

The game that was causing so much noise was—cricket!!

Cricket, even when played by schoolboys, is usually a reasonably quiet game. Enthusiastic cheers at every run are to be expected. So are loud cries of 'How's that!' But yells, screams, punches, and kicking are not usually associated with cricket.

Under the trees the batting side waited with ill-concealed impatience. Out in the middle two budding Peter Mays waited to hit the bowling to all parts of the field. Around them the battle raged. A heaving heap struggled for the stumper's pads and gloves. Others were scrambling for the ball. In the centre of the pitch stood a boy with the sun making his mop of golden hair look like a patch of a ripe cornfield. 'Bill, please go to long leg,' he shouted. 'Mike, mid-off . . . Mike!!' But still the battle raged. Finally, in despair, he yelled at the top of his voice, 'It's stupid, SIMPLY STUPID. What's the use of making me captain if you won't do what I say?'

At the end of the Sermon on the Mount St. Luke tells us that Jesus asked a similar question. In sorrow, but perhaps in anger too (for Jesus could be really angry—about the right things), He asked 'Why do you call me Lord and do not what I tell you?'

They listened to His words, and agreed that His teaching was simply splendid. They called Him by fine-sounding titles—Teacher, Master, Lord. But they didn't do what He told them.

We have read the teaching of Jesus. In our worship we have called Him many splendid things—

Jesus, my Shepherd, Brother, Friend,
My Prophet, Priest and King,
My Lord. . . .

you know! But somehow we've never got round to obeying Him. Never really followed the Shepherd, loved the Brother, heeded the Prophet, given our loyalty to the King, our whole lives to the Lord.

It's just no use giving Him these wonderful titles unless the things they stand for become realities in our relationship with Him.

In fact, 'It's stupid, simply stupid.'

The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Word of God in an Expanding Universe

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM C. BIGWOOD, B.D., STONEHAVEN

'All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.'—Jn 1^{3}.

'America to girdle the earth with satellite worlds'—'U.S. planning space satellites'—such were the newspaper headlines that met us a few months ago. What were our reactions? Did we find ourselves saying 'What will men be trying next?' or 'Wouldn't it be better if men left all this alone?' Or did the mention of satellite worlds open up new vistas of space travel and the thought that journeys into outer space might not be so fantastic as they once seemed; that reaching for the moon, if not for the stars, could no longer be set down merely as idle fancy?

Of course such ideas are not nearly so novel to men to-day as they once were. A whole new literature is growing up—oddly enough it is called science fiction—which is conditioning our minds, as we say, to the thought of space travel. Plays on the wireless, perhaps most significantly of all strip cartoons in the popular daily papers, are all contributing to familiarize us with the idea of men visiting other planets, if not with the idea of visitors from other planets coming to our earth.

All this raises an important question for the Christian. Is our thought of God big enough to meet the demands of an expanding universe? If it is not, then is it not our fault for not trying to understand or to take seriously enough the God whom the Bible reveals for He is big enough to meet all those new demands? It is true that the Bible writers knew nothing of our modern discoveries and inventions, knew nothing of aeroplane or radio, let alone inter-planetary travel, but that does not invalidate or make any less their understanding of God and revelation of Him which is able to take in all this. It does so because it starts from the simple and elementary but nevertheless profound truth that all things come from God—'All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made,' says St. John in the first chapter of his Gospel. All things are part of God's creation. The Bible knows nothing of the continent of America; but the continent of America was there when the Bible was being written. Columbus discovered America; he did not create it. And so with other things. Electricity was there, though it is only comparatively recently that men have discovered how to control and use it. The principles of radio were there, though it has been left to our age to reproduce it mechanically.

There are three passages of the Bible that seem particularly relevant to us thinking in terms of man-made satellites.

The first passage is Ps 139^{7-8}—'Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.' The Psalmist did not know anything about space-ships and space-travel, yet his understanding of God is big enough to cover that. 'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?' Have we asked ourselves that question? Or have we just casually assumed that the very idea of space-travel automatically does away with God or will make it possible to get away from Him? Well, the Bible is pretty definite that it doesn't. Of course from time immemorial men have toyed with the idea of running away from God. Adam and Eve hid from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the Garden; that was very childish. Jonah thought he could get away from God by booking a passage on a ship bound for Tarshish; that was childish too. As if God's authority only extended over the little Kingdom of Israel. Is it any less childish for us to-day to imagine that we can get away from God by taking passage in a space-ship and being shot up to the moon? People can, or used to be able to, escape from paying income tax by going and living in the Channel Islands. People can escape from the arm of the law by taking boat or plane to some out of the way corner of the world. People may be toying with the idea of escaping their cares and responsibilities by journeying into outer space. People can get away from each other. But God they cannot evade. Whatever the Psalmist knew, he was clear enough about that.

The second passage is Lk 11^{13}: 'If ye then,

being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?' It is Jesus who poses us with this question and while it is with asking and giving that He is immediately concerned, the principle behind the question is capable of infinite extension. The line of argument is clear. Jesus does not hesitate to argue from men to God—if you with all your faults know, how much more God? If man, mere man, can do this, that or the other thing, how much more God? Is this the question we find ourselves asking, face to face with all the ingenious discoveries and inventions of our day—if man is capable of achieving all this, how much more can we expect from God? Or have we got our thinking topsy-turvy, got it somehow into our heads that the increasing power and cleverness of man takes away, diminishes, eclipses, or even renders unnecessary the works and the power of God? Do we think that of course God does not know anything about all the ingenious devices which the fertile brain of man has discovered? Are we taking seriously our Lord's question? With all the evidence before us of the wit, cleverness, skill, ingenuity of man are we able to look beyond man to man's Maker and say with St. Paul: 'O the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God . . . For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory.'

The third passage is Mt 17^{20}: 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible to you.'

This is a promise, and a promise of Jesus at that. How it cuts clean across our hesitant, suspicious, cautious, defensive attitude towards new invention. There are people who say, 'If God had meant men to . . . He would have'—'If He had meant men to fly He would have provided them with wings.' What rubbish! Man's learning to fly is not flying in the face of Providence, but the result of man's using and developing and acting with the faculties and powers with which he has been endowed. It is no credit to man or to his Maker if he fails to make use of them. Above all, man is using his capacity for faith. And faith in the Bible sense is not a matter of believing a lot of things that have nothing to do with reality but grappling with reality, above all the reality that lies beyond what we can see and touch, the reality in dealing with which we have to walk by faith and not by sight. And to this faith our Lord makes the promise 'Nothing shall be impossible unto you.'

'The sky's the limit' we sometimes hear people say to-day. Well, for the Christian this is the case. For he knows himself to be a child of God, not some little God of his own making, but the God revealed in the Bible and in Jesus Christ, who is big enough to meet and satisfy all the demands and needs and contingencies.

Fifth Sunday after Trinity

Success in Failure

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

'And the Lord said unto David. . . . Whereas it was in thine heart to build an house unto my name, thou didst well that it was in thine heart.'—1 K 8^{18}.

King David's heart lay to poetry and music, perhaps to philosophy. He owed his first promotion in life to his musical ability, and it cannot have been chance which attributed the Book of Psalms to him. Unfortunately, however, he came to the throne in times too troublous to permit of his following his bent. He had perforce to smother his real tastes and turn warrior. Inevitably, in the hurly-burly of war and politics, his character coarsened. Lust was followed by adultery and deceit by murder. His conscience was not quite dead, however, and he could be, and was, brought to repentance. Finally, he came to more placid days. His last battle was fought. Rich and honoured, the King-Emperor looked back in his leisure on all the way he had come. What he saw—destruction, blood-shed and hatred—filled him with disgust and horror. So there grew to a passion in his heart the thought he had always had—to build a temple to the God whose goodness and mercy had followed him all his life. This would be his memorial, something grand and clean and fine. It is not an unusual reaction. Columba came to Scotland as a missionary on the rebound from a warrior's life. Ignatius Loyola diverted his soldierly talents to the service of his church, in a sudden disgust at the sordidness of battle. War is so destructive and sterile, that, in fine souls, it breeds an ache for enduring things. So was it, at any rate, in the case of David. With the enthusiasm of those who know that their time on earth is limited, he set about making his plans, and gathering the workmen and materials for his great project. But it was not to be. It is true that God accepted his devotion. As Solomon reports it—'The Lord said unto David my father. Whereas it was in thine heart to build an house unto my name, thou didst well'; but David himself tells, in 1 Chronicles, how the word of the Lord came to him, saying, 'Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars: thou shalt not build

an house unto my name, because thou hast shed much blood. . . . Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a man of rest; . . . He shall build an house for my name.' In due time Solomon did build the Temple, the very name of which still stands for magnificence and beauty. But David never saw it. He died with it built only in his heart, with nothing constructive to show for his long life. In the eyes of the world which puts store by victories he had not failed; in his own eyes he had. But God looked deeper. He gave him credit for his dreams. God said 'Thou didst well'—not because of anything he had done, but because of the purpose which lay, still-born, in his heart.

Most of us, unless we are very young, will give thanks for his judgment on David's life. The road to hell is paved with good intentions, it is said, but so also, by our text, is the road to heaven if the intentions are really sincere. If we have tried our best and failed, then, by God's amazing mercy, we are credited with success. Samuel Rutherford says somewhere that we 'Go in at heaven's gate, book in hand, still learning.'

Partly, no doubt, it is that we see the vanity of the thing we really do. If David had built the Temple, he might have wished that he had consolidated the throne. So is it ever. There is an old Scots saying, 'Our best things here have a worm in them.' Life is short. All we want to do can't be squeezed into it and it is what is squeezed out we think most of. Most ministers have met successful business men and politicians who say that they too would like to have been ministers—and they mean it too. But, if they had become ministers, they would have had times when they wondered if they had made a mistake. The thing we have done by its very familiarity loses its appeal for us, and at the end of our lives it is our dream temples that matter most.

And they matter, these dreams, not only as a standard by which we judge what we really do, nor even only because they keep us humble. They matter for the sake of others. David's dream was realized, even if not for him. Under Solomon the lovely thing took shape as it never would have but for the son's knowledge of his father's vision. How often that happens! The son is given, and takes, the chance the father would have loved but never had. How many of us are aware in life of building on foundations we never laid! The first missionaries to the Falklands were all killed before a single convert was made. A useless sacrifice, some might say—fruitless and barren! But the Falklands are Christian to-day! Some day, somewhere, building on the patient research work of thousands of doctors, some one will light upon a cure for cancer. Although we accomplish nothing, our dreams don't die with us.

Yet it is not easy to live on with a burning in our bones and an eagerness in our hearts, with no guarantee of our heart's desire coming to be. That, I take it, is the meaning of Christian hope. You remember the great passage in Hebrews about the heroes of the faith? 'What shall I more say? for time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets; Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions.' Ah, these were the great ones! But there were those others, the ones who only failed. They had 'trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented. . . . These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'

Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, who died with their dreams only in their hearts, let us run with faith and hope and patience the race that is set before us—

> Behold a witness nobler still,
> who trod affliction's path,
> Jesus, at once the finisher
> and author of our faith.

What is it about the Lord Jesus Christ which has caught and held the devotion of millions down through the ages? What is it about Him which strangely stirs our own hearts, and holds us, when we would fain be at our slothful ease? Is it that His dreams all came true? Is it that His best hopes were all realized? Is it that His expectations were all fulfilled? Is it not rather that He died, humanly speaking, a failure, died with His hopes shattered, His Church hardly begun, His Kingdom a seemingly hopeless dream; died and rose again, so that none who follow Him need ever doubt or fear that their good intentions are meaningless, or their frustrated plans of good a senseless thing.

What if our best endeavours come to nought and cruel circumstances block our highest hopes? What if the Kingdom seems to come so slowly that it hardly may be said to come at all? If, with our eyes on Christ, we can say honestly that we have tried, we may be sure that, out of our failures, His victories will be built. When, with our pitiful little record of defeat, we go before Him, when even His gentle eyes can see no signs of high endeavour or great success in our lives, He will yet, marvellously

kind, say 'Well done,' and echoing this old word of God to His servant, David, give us credit for what we never even began to do—'Thou did'st well that it was in thine heart.'

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Private Enterprise in Religion

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD G. NEWSHAM, M.A., HARTFORD, CONN., U.S.A.

'David encouraged himself in the Lord his God.'—1 S 30^6.

That strikes me as an unusual and important use of the word 'encouraged.'

To encourage means 'to put heart into'; 'to embolden'; 'to incite to further endeavour'; 'to help a fellow to his feet again when he has failed or fallen.' And the usual use of the word is in the active sense of one individual encouraging another. Indeed among the virtues which most people practise almost as naturally as they breathe or walk is this of encouragement. Every man knows his own need of encouragement. He knows the devastating effect upon himself of discouragement. We all understand that life is tough for some people all the time; and for all people some of the time; and therefore it is an elementary social duty to live as an encourager of our fellow-men, ready with a helping hand, an inspiriting word, a friendly nod or smile.

1. Has it occurred to us that there can be a parallel duty, possibly a prior duty, of self-encouragement? A duty, that is to say, to address to ourselves those stimulating and heartening things in some dark hour of the spirit, or on some steep and hazardous face of the mountain, which we would assuredly try hard to say to another in a like situation?

May there not be a parallel, in the spiritual life, to the disquiet many feel to-day about the increasing tendency of individuals in the social and economic order to expect help from outside sources before, or in default of, making any strenuous personal effort to grapple with the problem themselves?

The question must be asked with all restraint and sympathy, because in the complexities of contemporary life there are problems which the individual cannot cope with alone. There have, of necessity, to be agencies of many kinds through which society can manifest its concern for the welfare of the individual. It is a Christian precept that we should seek to bear one another's burdens.

Yet it is also a Christian principle that every one should bear his own burden. He is not, indeed, a man if he is not somewhere shouldering his own load; pulling with his own might and main on the oar which is his.

But, if this be so, must not the principle apply to another area of life—the religious and spiritual? Is it not conceivable that we have all become very much undersold on the private enterprise principle in religion?

2. But let us leave these generalizations and turn to David. Briefly the story was this. To escape the relentless hatred of Saul, David had actually fled for cover to the Philistines—he who once had championed Israel against the Philistine Goliath. But when war between the Philistines and a neighbouring tribe broke out, David's assistance is spurned. He might be a fifth columnist who, in a critical moment, could turn the tide of battle against them. So David is ordered back to the encampment where he and his followers had been given permission to live, with the command to remain there 'for the duration.' In the meantime, however, the enemy had raided the place. When David and his men arrive, there is nothing but a heap of smouldering ruins. The women and children have been captured. So appalling was the desolation that David and his men, in the poignant words of the narrative, 'lifted up their voices and wept, until they had no more power to weep.' Yet worse was to come. Fury and terror demanded an object on which to vent their awful power. So David's own men turned upon him as the cause of their calamity, threatening to stone him.

By all normal calculations, David is down and out. But there is this incalculable element of the spirit to be taken into the reckoning. This man, despite the stains upon his character, is no ordinary man. He has interior resources to fall back upon. So, to the inspiration of countless readers of the tale in many a tight corner of life, this black hour in David's career is illuminated by these stirring words: 'But David encouraged himself in the Lord his God.'

3. This is a note that we do not hear sounded, perhaps, as often as we imperatively need to hear it.

There is much emphasis, and rightly so, both in the Bible and in the teaching of the Church, upon the importance of the community of believers; the household of the Faith; the worshipping congregation. At least one of the Psalms tells of some individual, in the throes of a personal crisis, who is at his wit's end. He can see no glimmer of light in his darkness; no way forward for his feet; until—until what?—until he joins in the corporate worship of his brethren, praising and adoring the God of their fathers, and their God. And then, somehow, something happens. He goes out from the Temple worship with strength renewed, armed in the spirit for his own particular warfare with his own particular adversary.

Yet there is a personal warfare to be waged and won in the depths of oneself. There is a faith to be discovered for oneself, on the rock of which one's own feet are to be solidly set, so that you can say 'though all the world deny, yet will not I.' We become a person, an individual, when we gain —no matter what our genes or our environment— an adamantine core which can persist steadfastly, true to itself, in changing environments; whether in a favourable or an untoward lot; whether in the church and among the faithful on Sunday or in the rough and tumble of the world. 'But David encouraged himself in the Lord his God.' Here is miracle. Here, if anywhere, is the freedom which is the despair of determinism. Here is personal religion in its finest hour. Here is the private enterprise of the spirit which it is the purpose of public worship to kindle in the soul and then to be reinforced by the united life and power of such persons in assembly together.

4. Jesus, we read, went 'as his custom was' to the synagogue on the Sabbath. He found high value in the public ordinances of religion. He emphasized the importance of the group; the two or three gathering together. He gave the world a prayer which is plainly meant to be prayed in community, not in solitude: 'Our Father, which art in heaven.' 'Give us this day our daily bread.' Luke's Gospel manifestly gives us the occasion when Jesus taught the disciples this prayer. Matthew's 'Sermon on the Mount' is plainly a collection of many sayings and teachings of Jesus, arranged under subject headings, irrespective of the time or place or context of their actual utterance.

Over against His endorsement of the high value of the community or social factor in religion, Jesus also pleaded the necessity for private enterprise in religion; personal communion with God. 'Enter your private room,' He said, 'and close the door, and pray to your Father who seeth in secret.' Don't think that is only possible in a biggish home. By present standards, Jesus lived in a two-roomed slum.

If we only pray at a time and place where it is the 'done thing' by social use and wont to pray and praise, what are we doing but conforming to convention, even if it be a good convention? But if there is this personal altar, unseen by any other eyes than our own, then the balance will be kept between public assistance and private initiative in the most momentous business of all in life.

And in those inevitable hours which everyone has to meet by himself alone, even if physically he is surrounded by a multitude, he will be no stranger to the victorious experience of a David who, not for the first time surely in Ziklag, 'encouraged himself in the Lord his God.'

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Will the Dead Live Forever?

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR GEORGE JOHNSTON, B.D., PH.D., EMMANUEL COLLEGE, TORONTO, CANADA

'For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.'—1 Co 15^{22} (R.S.V.).

1. In *Wind, Sand and Stars* the famous French airman, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, tells how at the beginning of his career as a mail pilot on the night flight his field manager warned him about careless compass navigation above the clouds. 'You want to remember,' said the manager, 'that below the sea of clouds lies eternity.'

It is a warning that many healthy men and women don't hear and heed as often as they should. We must reckon with death, the brother of sleep. No living soul can escape. It will come as friend or enemy. It may come suddenly or quietly, in youth or in old age; the one thing that is certain is that it will come. We had all better face the facts of life.

Of course, there are blustering men who will not take death seriously or at least are so irresponsible that they cannot see how their death can affect many others among the living. Exupéry says again: 'I would not give a fig for anybody's contempt for death. If its roots are not sunk deep in an acceptance of responsibility, this contempt for death is the sign either of an impoverished soul or of youthful extravagance.' He then contrasts a suicide, who impressed him with a lack of dignity, with another man. 'I remembered the death of a man. He was a gardener, and he was speaking on his deathbed: "You know, I used to sweat sometimes when I was digging. My rheumatism would pull at my leg, and I would damn myself for a slave. And now, do you know, I'd like to spade and spade. It's beautiful work. A man is free when he is using a spade. And besides, who is going to prune my trees when I am gone?"

'The man was leaving behind him a fallow field, a fallow planet. He was bound by ties of love to all cultivable land and to all the trees of the earth. There was a generous man, a prodigal man, a noble man! There was a man who, battling against death in the name of his Creation, could . . . be called a man of courage!'

Indeed we need such courage. The day will come when the hand of the Reaper will strike in our own home. Then we know what desolation means. Then we face the grim realities of our mortality. Nothing can hide the separation.

2. Will the dead remain dead, then? Is eternal separation to be our lot?

Christians believe that there is hope. Death for mankind is more than animal demise or the fading of physical powers. It is tied up with our sin, and must be related to our faith that there is a divine Creator. 'As all in Adam die, so all in Christ shall live.' St. Paul argues that there are two orders of being now. Either we remain unredeemed, self-centred, unscrupulous, paying no regard to any future possibility of judgment and punishment: that is, we are like ancient Adam in the Bible; we deliberately do wrong to suit our own convenience and may even deny God's reality altogether. The end of such a life is death for soul and body, unless God has some means of arresting the sinner that we do not know. The alternative is that we have found the reconciling grace of God our Father in Jesus Christ. We have become church members by professing our faith and by sharing the communion of the saints. This means a new kind of life, a new start here and now. We are spiritual and we look forward to future blessedness. 'Death cannot separate us from God's love in Christ,' we say at a Christian funeral. God takes the souls of the departed to Himself, we assure the mourning.

About the new life of heaven we can speak only in pictures. It is the happiest of lives; it is secure; it is fellowship with our God and all His company. The people there are not made perfect without us; and we shall not be made perfect until the full number of the redeemed enter in. There is no possible end to it, for God is everlasting, and life with Him through Christ will be eternal. Joy in praising our Saviour; rest after conflict; exploration of our friends and of God's wonders: for we shall know even as also we are known. Growing into the full likeness of Christ must surely await us too.

3. Now, leaving aside all the questions that many folk might want to ask, there is perhaps one that most would like to have answered. It is the simplest and the most poignant, and it is this: How can we be sure that our dead live on, without some visible proof?

The reply may be put as a counter-question: '*Are you sure of your Christ?*' What does it mean to you that Jesus said, 'God is not a God of dead people but of the living; for He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob'? Jesus simply could not believe in the Heavenly Father without also accepting His constant care for His children. Jesus died, committing His spirit into the Father's keeping. Jesus rose from the dead by the mighty act of God at Easter. Is all this a fable and a mirage? Did nothing really happen, and were Peter, James, and John, the Five Hundred, the Eleven, James the Lord's brother and Saul of Tarsus: were they all dupes and phonies? When Paul thinks of death, he thinks of being with Christ Jesus, his risen and victorious Saviour.

It will be a new form but a continuing person. God will provide a house, a garment, a body. Paul uses all three methods to say that eternal life must in his opinion have some kind of embodiment; not flesh and blood, for that is mortal; but some thing by which we may express ourselves and communicate.

Again, in answer to the searching question, 'But are you sure? How can we be sure?', one might ask, '*Are you sure of the Spirit within you?*' For it was also Paul's conviction that here the Church exists. What a miracle that is to him! The Church is that supernatural Body in which the Holy Spirit of God is living. He has come to be the actual proof of God's intention to give us the fullness of eternity later. Here and now we have the Spirit of Christ, because our Risen Lord has become a life-giving spirit, part of the everlasting order that we call God. This new life is an instalment of what is to be; a real share in fellowship with God; a real communion with Christ Jesus, whose Body the Church is. This is the secret of Paul's certainty. He was already in an eternal Body by being in the Church of God, His earthly family.

'What think you now of Christ?' they said to Samuel Rutherford on his deathbed. 'I shall live and adore Him.' How could he know, if he did not already know Jesus Christ as a living, judging, saving Power in his life? If he did not have sweet foretaste of the festal joy that is the Lamb's great bridal feast of bliss and love?

4. How can you be sure? Ah, men and women, you can only be sure that in Christ the dead live for ever when you are yourself caught into the wonder of that immortal love that was made flesh in the Lord Jesus and for our sakes was crucified at Calvary. Life in God is offered to us all now; and that life is sustained by the food and drink Christ provides by giving us in His sacrament His flesh and blood, the tokens of His own deathless personality. Redeemed people need not argue over the details of the life that is life with Christ; they must be anxious to preach the gospel of new life to the unredeemed; and they must seek ever to be faithful and true in the Body of Christ that is the Church. For the danger is not that we may get false notions of the heavenly Jerusalem; it is that we may sin and trespass and doubt and fall away from our Divine Lord, that we may break our vows, become vain and conceited and careless. God save us from that because that is the way of death even for those who once tasted the powers of the age to come.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

IX. The Servant of the Lord

By Lektor D.Theol. Curt Lindhagen, Nyköping, Sweden

I. The Servant Problem

1. One of the commonest and richest expressions in the Old Testament for the relation between man and God is that contained in the words 'serve, service, servant.[1] The Servant-idea has, especially in its positive aspects of protection and victory, a prominent place in Deutero-Isaiah. The expression 'the servant of the Lord' is used thirteen or fourteen times in Is 40–55 of the people Israel-Jacob. The four Servant-passages, $42^{1ff.}$ $49^{1ff.}$ $50^{4ff.}$ $52^{13ff.}$, have often been thought to portray another servant of the Lord, another Ebed Yahweh, than that in the context.

2. The problem of this Servant *kat' exochen*, often called 'the Suffering Servant,' was presented in an entirely new way by Bernhard Duhm in his *Die Theologie der Propheten* [1875], 288 f. Duhm separated Is 42^{1-7} 49^{1-6} 50^{4-9} 52^{13}–53^{12} as an entity which originally had a different conception of the Servant and a different author from the rest of Is 40–66. The term Ebed Yahweh-Songs (*Ebed Jahwe-Lieder*) was coined by Duhm in his Isaiah Commentary [1892] in which the first Song was limited to 42^{1-4}.

3. The Ebed Yahweh-Songs are some of the most important but also most disputed texts of the Old Testament. They contain Is 53, the culmination of prophecy, the chapter on vicarious suffering, of extraordinary importance both for Jesus and for the Early Church.

The sharp differences of view which have characterized Christian interpretation of the Servant-Songs ever since the end of the eighteenth century, when the Isaianic authorship of Is 40 ff. began to be questioned, have continued steadily and undiminished. The literature on this central problem has long been so extensive that not even the specialist can master it all.

For the history of the discussion C. R. North's monumental work *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* [1948, 2nd ed. in the press] is without rival. A very valuable and fully documented account of the most recent literature is found in two articles by H. H. Rowley in his *The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament* [1952].[2] Amongst newer surveys of twentieth-century work—apart from Commentaries on Isaiah and Introductions to the Old Testament—mention may be made of works by H. Kruse,[3] O. Eissfeldt,[4] S. Mowinckel,[5] J. S. van der Ploeg,[6] P. A. Vaccari,[7] C. Lindhagen,[8] and R. S. Cripps.[9] Recent Scandinavian work on the problem (Mowinckel, Nyberg, Engnell, Bentzen) has been reviewed by C. R. North,[10] while C. Lindhagen[11] has given a full account of the Swedish research which has aroused so much attention in international scholarship.

II. The Servant-Songs in the Light of the Latest Research

With what questions does inquiry concern itself, say since the Second World-War?

A. The 'Isagogic' Problem

1. There is still much disagreement about the extent of the Songs.[12] On other questions of introduction there is a relative *consensus*. As to their authorship, Mowinckel[13] has since 1931 ascribed

[1] See further C. Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament* [1950].

[2] 'The Servant of the Lord in the Light of three Decades of Criticism' (pp. 1–57); 'The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah' (pp. 59–88).

[3] *Verbum Domini*, xxix. [1951], 195 f., 286 f., 346 f.

[4] *Theologische Literaturzeitung* [1943], cols. 273 ff.; cf. *ib.*, 'The Ebed-Jahwe in Isaiah xl.-lv. in the Light of the Israelite Conceptions of the Community and the Individual, the Ideal and the Real,' in The Expository Times, xliv. [1932–33], 261–268.

[5] *Acta Orientalia*, xvi. [1937–38], 29–40.

[6] *Les chants du Serviteur de Jahvé* [1936], pp. xiii.–xx.

[7] *Miscellanea Biblica*, ii. [1934], 216–44.

[8] *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, viii. [1932], 350–75.

[9] *The Prophets and the Atonement* [1931], 10–16.

[10] *Scottish Journal of Theology* [1950], 363–379, also *The Suffering Servant*, 2nd ed.

[11] *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, xviii.–xix. [1953–54], 32–71.

[12] Thus Engnell, *Rylands Bulletin*, xxxi. [1948], 65 ff., makes the first Song 42^{1-12} and the second 49^{1-13}, while H. Friedländer, *Der Knecht Gottes* [1947], reckons 50^{10}-51^{8} as a Song.

[13] Most recently in *Han som kommer* [1951], 148, 170 f.

them to a prophet of the Deutero-(Trito-) Isaianic circle. Most scholars agree that all four Songs refer to the same Servant.[1] The organic relation, formal and ideological, of the Songs to their context(s), which earlier was asserted mainly by the collectivists, is a question on which there is now more general agreement. Kissane's statement is typical: 'The context is the guide to the interpretation, and disregard of the context leads to chaos.'[2] Engnell, who endorses this judgment of Kissane, decides from his tradition-historical standpoint that Deutero-Isaiah, including the Songs, is a prophetic imitation of a New Year Festival liturgy.[3] Mowinckel, on the other hand, maintains, following earlier form- and style-critical analyses by Gressmann [1914] and Köhler [1923], that the Songs, and likewise Is 40–55 as a whole, consist of what were originally independent literary units or *Gattungen*. And since the present positions of these units in the context are secondary, and are determined by a 'catchword' arrangement, no conclusions about their contents can be drawn from their present relations to their contexts.[4]

2. Treatment of the text[5] of the Songs has become decidedly more conservative, especially in Uppsala. There are many reasons for this. Hebrew philologists, following in the footsteps of classical philologists, have begun to get the better of a century-old, violent and often arbitrary method of text-emendation. The text-critical principles employed by H. S. Nyberg on the Book of Hosea[6] and Is 53[7] have certainly contributed to this. Both the Dead Sea Isaiah texts show the high antiquity of the Massoretic tradition. The variations between the *textus massoreticus* and the complete Isaiah scroll (DSIa Burrows) have been examined by J. Lindblom both for chs. 40–55 as a whole[8] and for the Servant-Songs in particular.[9] The differences are certainly numerous but are mainly *minutiae*, indeed mostly *orthographica*. ('Israel,' 49^3, is found even in DSIa).

B. *Interpretation of the Servant*

The identification of the Servant of the Songs has been along two main lines, collective and individual, each with a number of variations.

1. *The Contrast between individual and collective.* The sharp antithesis in which individual and collective interpretations have stood to one another, especially since the 1890's, has in these last decades been appreciably lessened.

(*a*) One main reason for this is the new view of the relation between individual and collective which about 1910 was presented, so far as primitive peoples are concerned, by the French sociological school (Lévy-Bruhl, Durkheim), and which has been applied to the Old Testament principally by J. Pedersen (1920 ff.) and specifically to the Ebed Yahweh-problem by H. Wheeler Robinson[10] and, independently, by O. Eissfeldt.[11]

According to this view a sharp contrast between individual and collective is an antithesis foreign to the markedly synthetic thought of the Old Testament, but belongs rather to a modern Western way of thinking, in which the individual is regarded as '*individuum in se et distinctum a quolibet alio*' (Coppens). The people, which, as a supra-individual (*överindividuell*) totality—'ideal quantity,' to use Pedersen's expression—has an unbroken existence in past, present, and future time, can, according to Eissfeldt, as an ideal entity (*ideale Grösse*) well have a mission to a certain empirical manifestation of its being as a real entity (*reale Grösse*).[12] A people, so Wheeler Robinson, can function as an individual through one or more of its members who are considered as its representatives.[13] Since the individual (group)

[1] Different views are entertained by, among others, E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah*, ii. [1943], who thinks of three different Servants: in the first and second Songs Israel, in the third the prophet himself, and in the fourth the Messiah; and S. Smith, *Isaiah, Chapters XL.–LV.* [1944], who makes the first Song ($42^{1-4.\ 5-9}$) refer to Cyrus and the other three to the prophet.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. lxviii. Cf. N. H. Snaith, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lvi. [1944–45], 79 ff.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 5 f., 13 f.

[4] See further the survey in Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif*, 198 ff.; S. Mowinckel, *Han som kommer*, 333, *n.* 5.

[5] Special polyglot editions of the Songs have been published by P. Boccaccio—G. Bernardi, *Servus Jahweh* [1950], and H. Hegermann, *Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta* [1954]. For the LXX. mention may be made of Ziegler's edition of Isaiah [1939] (Göttingen edition of the LXX., XIV.).

[6] *Studien zum Hoseabuche* [1953], with the important statement of principles, pp. 1–20.

[7] *S.E.Å.*, vii. [1942], 5–82.

[8] *S.T.K.*, xxvi. [1950], 302–14.

[9] *Z.A.W.*, lxiii. [1951], 235–48.

[10] *The Cross of the Servant* [1926]; 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality,' *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, B.Z.A.W.*, lxvi. [1936], 49–62.

[11] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xliv. [1932–33], 261–268.

[12] J. Pedersen is of the same opinion (*Israel*, iii.–iv. [Danish ed., 1934], 456 f.); so also N. Johansson, *Parakletoi* [1940], 49–62, who stresses the ancestor-motif and sees in the Servant a personification of Israel according to Old Testament conceptions of the 'intercessor' (*Fürsprecher*).

[13] Cf. Torrey's Servant-idea: '. . . always the same: namely, the personified nation Israel, or Israel's personal representative' (*The Second Isaiah* [1928], 135).

is regarded as 'identical' with the group (the people) he represents,[1] swift transitions can take place between individual (group) and people and *vice versa*; the 'systole' and 'diastole' of the Servant-figure has here its explanation. Examples of such 'corporate personalities' are the ancestor, the prophet, the king. The oscillation between individual and people which we meet in the Servant-Songs, should be seen against this background. According to Wheeler Robinson the Servant is Israel but also the prophet himself as the people's representative, and the followers of the prophet who share his faith.

Eissfeldt's interpretation is thus clearly collective, while Robinson's may be called fluid-collective. But even individual exegesis has taken corporate personality into its vocabulary. Thus, the newer messianic interpretation willingly acknowledges that the king is a collective figure, who in a certain sense embodies and is 'identical' with his people.[2]

(*b*) Another reason why it is difficult to decide whether an interpretation is to be classified as individual or collective, is the great number of motifs which many scholars assume to lie behind the Servant-figure. J. Ph. Hyatt[3] in a valuable specialized examination gives four principal motifs: corporate personality, in which the righteousness of an individual or a group is credited to the larger unit; the rôle of the prophet, especially Jeremiah; the idea of sacrifice; and the myth of the dying and rising god. (Among other things Hyatt cites parallels between the Ras Shamra texts and Is 53.)[4] Individual, collective, and mythological motifs are here given varying measures of relevance, and so often lead to fluid and at times quite complicated interpretations.

The tendency toward a more synthetic interpretation is thus obvious in recent research.

2. *Collective Interpretation.* Recent collective interpretation presents a range of earlier well-known variations: the Servant is the entire Israelite people, the pious kernel of the people, the ideal Israel, etc.

(*a*) The identification of the Servant with Israel in its entirety, to which K. Budde (*Die sogenannten Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder* [1900])[5] gave classic shape for his own time, still has a number of advocates, such as R. Pfeiffer,[6] E. J. Kissane[7] (for the first and second Songs), J. Ph. Hyatt,[7] H. Friedländer,[8] P. Humbert,[9] A. Lods,[10] J. A. Bewer,[11] and L. G. Rignell.[12]

Particular motifs have been stated by S. H. Hooke, F. M. Th. de Liagre Böhl, and S. H. Blank.

According to Hooke[13] the main thought of the Songs is that Israel through its dispersion over the ancient world spreads the knowledge of the true God among the heathen; that was the purpose of Israel's suffering. The author of the Songs, he maintains, transferred to Israel the main element in the Near Eastern cult-pattern; the representative individual's death became the Servant's death, *i.e.*, Israel's death in the political sense.[14] Böhl's[15] interpretation is also clearly collective: the Servant is Israel. Böhl, who earlier[16] described the Servant as an ideal figure with elements from the Israelite people as well as from the Davidic dynasty, the coming Messiah and the circle of Tammuz-ideas, asserts that the ideology associated

[1] N. H. Snaith, *J.T.S.*, xliv. [1943], 82, holds that there is a clear distinction should be made between 'representation' and 'virtual identification.'

[2] Traces of similar lines of thought appear already in J. F. Telge, *Meletemata*, i. [1816], 322, and were brought forward in 1857 by Franz Delitzsch in his well-known pyramid-theory: the Servant is found right through to the apex of the pyramid in the Christ-Messiah, who is 'Israel in person.' The terms 'systole' and 'diastole' were already used by Delitzsch. For a criticism of this conception see T. H. Weir, *The Westminster Review*, clxix. [1908], 309.

[3] *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, iii. [1944], 79–86. Hyatt himself interprets the Servant as Israel and stresses the fulfilment of the prophecy in Jesus.

[4] E. J. Young, on the other hand, stresses the differences; *The Westminster Theological Journal*, xiii. 1950–51], 19–33.

[5] The sub-title: *Ein Minoritätsvotum*, was indicative of the state of opinion at the turn of the century.

[6] *Introduction* [1941], p. 478 f.

[7] See *supra*.

[8] *Der Knecht Gottes* [1947]. The collective is the traditional interpretation in Judaism; cf. H. A. Fischel, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, xviii. [1944], 53–76; I. W. Slotky, *Isaiah* [Soncino Books, 1949], refers all four Songs to the faithful remnant of Israel.

[9] In *La Bible du Centenaire*, ii. [1947], 389, 416.

[10] *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* [1950], 472 ff.

[11] *The Book of Isaiah* [1950].

[12] *S.T.K.*, xxviii. [1952], 26–32 (Is $49^{1-(7)13}$), *ib.* xxix. [1953], 108–19 (Is $50^{4-9(11)}$), with a number of new suggestions on the linguistic interpretation of these texts.

[13] *Prophets and Priests* (The Interpreter Series, iii.) [1938], 40–42.

[14] Cf. J. M. Powis Smith, *The Prophets and their Times* [2nd ed., rev. by W. A. Irwin, 1941, third impression 1946], 228 ff., and earlier M. Haller, *Das Judentum* (*S.A.T.*, ii. 3) [1914], 55 ff.

[15] *Prophetentum und stellvertretendes Leiden in Assyrien und Israel*, ii. [Opera minora, 1953, 70–80]; *Missions- und Erwählungsgedanke in Alt-Israel* [*ib.*, 81–100] (published earlier in *Festschrift* Bertholet [1950], 77–96.

[16] *De 'Knecht des Heeren' in Jezaja 53* [1923].

with the monarchy was after the catastrophe of 586 carried over to the people.[1] He calls attention in this connexion to the Assyro-Babylonian substitute monarchy and instances the fate of a certain Damqî in 670 B.C., but finds its application to Jehoiachin in the year 560 hardly probable. In any case, he maintains, Jehoiachin is not the Servant of the Songs,[2] but his rehabilitation may have clarified the meaning of the centuries-old history of the Servant-idea to which the Songs give expression[3]: Israel's suffering in the exile, conceived as atoning, was also a collective death. When Israel was freed from exile, the peoples would sing and testify to Israel, just as the initiates in the mystery-cults sang about their god who through his resurrection guarantees them life (Böhl refers to Ezk 8^{18}, Zech 12^{4}). The suffering and triumphant Servant is described with features taken from the varied fortunes of great Davidic kings like Hezekiah and Josiah. When in $49^{5f.}$ the Servant is assigned a missionary vocation to Israel, this means that the apostate ten tribes are, with and through Judah, to have a share in the messianic salvation.

While Böhl has thus stressed the kingly-messianic element in the mission of the Servant, S. H. Blank[4] gives prominence to the prophetic element. The lineaments of suffering have their prototype in the tragic fate of Jeremiah.[5]

(*b*) The collective interpretation also appears in modified form, and in a variety of ways. The Servant is regarded not as Israel in its entirety but as a specific empirical manifestation of Israel, or the ideal Israel, and can thus in $49^{5f.}$ be credited with a mission to Israel.

The Servant is Israel 'after the spirit,' the pious kernel of the people (the *Chasidim*, B. D. Eerdmans[6]), who suffer for the rest of Israel and for the heathen (I. G. Matthews[7]), the righteous remnant (J. N. Schofield[8]), identified with 'the true Israel' (P. A. H. de Boer[9]), 'the pattern of the ideal Israelite' (A. G. Hebert[10]).

We have already seen that this modified collective interpretation has been linked up with the conception of 'corporate personality.' To the same line of interpretation may also be reckoned C. Ryder Smith,[11] N. A. Dahl,[12] and, on the whole, H. H. Rowley.[13] In his Ebed-interpretation Rowley —to speak in Delitzsch's terms—makes use of the entire Servant-pyramid. The first Song applies to Israel, the second to 'a purified Israel,' the third to the nation as a whole, or, perhaps, to one of its individual representatives and leaders, the fourth to an individual still to come who is to carry out Israel's world-mission but who is nevertheless not the Davidic Messiah.[14] The fulfilment of the Servant-prophecy in Christ, in which—for the first time—the equation Servant = Messiah takes place, has also a collective aspect, the Church.[15] Fluidity also characterizes the Servant-idea according to W. F. Albright[16]: the Servant is the people Israel, the pious individual, and Israel's coming Saviour.

(*c*) J. Lindblom[17] supposes that there are

[1] Cf. L. E. Browne, *Messianic Hope in its Historical Setting* [1951], who identifies the Servant with Israel, which in its turn is identified with the messianic king (Is 55^{3-5}).

[2] The thesis that Jehoiachin was the Servant was earlier asserted by L. Bähler [1893], by an anonymous writer in *American Israelite* [1899], by Sellin [1901, 1908–20], by W. Stärk [1908, for Is 53], by L. H. W. Bleeker (rectorial address at Groningen, 1921), and by E. Burrows (for the third and fourth Songs [1940]; see below). It has been seen later in the form that Jehoiachin's fate was a prototype of the Servant's; cf. also M. Schmidt, *Prophet und Tempel* [1948], 229, who thinks that the idea of a Jehoiachin *redivivus* may have been in the mind of Deutero-Isaiah.

[3] Cf. N. H. Snaith, 'Studies in Old Testament Prophecy' in *Festschrift* T. H. Robinson [1950], 191: the Servant is primarily Jehoiachin and the 597 exiles, later also the 586 exiles. Israel's salvation is bound up with this remnant; cf. *ib.* THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lvi. [1944], 79–81.

[4] *H.U.C.A.*, xv. [1940], 18–32.

[5] A similar suggestion was made by F. A. Farley, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxxviii. [1926–27], 521–524: Israel, *i.e.*, the prophetic element in the nation, is to be the world's Jeremiah.

[6] *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, i. [1942], 255 f.; *The Religion of Israel* [1947], 216 f.; yet not the *Chasidim* of Maccabean times, as R. H. Kennett maintained [1911].

[7] *The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel* [1947], 174 ff.

[8] *The Religious Background of the Bible* [1944], 159 f.

[9] *O.T.S.*, iii. [1943], 196; *ib.*, xi. [1956], 102–17.

[10] *The Authority of the Old Testament* [1947], 146, cf. *ib.*, 178.

[11] *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation* [1941], 72 (rev. ed. [1946], 51 ff.).

[12] *Das Volk Gottes* [1941], 42.

[13] *The Servant of the Lord* [1952], 49–57; see also *The Unity of the Bible* [1953], 59 f.; *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* [1950], 111 ff.; 'The Meaning of Sacrifice,' in *Rylands Bulletin*, xxxiii. [1950], 103 ff.; *The Missionary Message* [1945], 51 ff.; *Israel's Mission to the World* [1939], 10 ff.; cf. *Submission in Suffering* [1942], 45.

[14] Similarly G. Gerleman, 'Herrens Tjänare' in *Nordisk Teologisk Uppslagsbok*, i. [1952], cols. 1305–8.

[15] Cf. H. de Lubac, *Le fondement théologique des missions* [1946], 23 f.

[16] *From the Stone Age to Christianity* [2nd ed., 1946], 254 f.

[17] *The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah* [1951], a comprehensive monograph.

different Servant-figures in the Songs and that they are all to be interpreted allegorically of Israel. In 42^{1-4} we have a description of a vassal king of Yahweh; 49^{1-6} and 50^{4-9} refer to the prophet himself; 53^{2-12} to a leper, who, like the vassal king, is a wholly fictitious person. These different Servant-figures symbolically represent different sides of the situation and mission of exilic Israel. The proper question to ask is therefore, 'What does the Servant *represent*?', not 'Who is the Servant?' The Songs are in other words allegories and are placed in interpretative contexts 42^{5-9} 49^{7} $50^{10f.}$ 52^{13}–53^{1}. For the original unity, which consists of Song and interpretation, Lindblom has coined the term 'Ebed Yahweh-oracle.'

[*To be continued.*

Contemporary Religious Trends

Science and Religion

By Herbert G. Wood, D.D., Birmingham

Is there a rapprochement between science and religion to-day? (In other words, are there signs of a growing appreciation of religion among scientists and of a growing appreciation of science among Christian believers?)

There is an inevitable tension between the scientific and the religious approaches to reality, but such tension need not be interpreted as involving a choice between mutually exclusive alternatives. Earlier interpretations of this tension in terms of conflict nevertheless persist. In his study of the *Seventeenth Century Background*, Mr. Basil Willey described humility as the vital breath of both religion and science. 'The humility of each consists largely in keeping to its own sphere and recognizing the independent validity of each.' But he added, 'it seems almost impossible to prevent both religion and science from becoming assertive in each other's sphere.' 'Religion ceases to be *scientifically* humble, and science ceases to be *metaphysically* humble.'

Though alien to the true scientific temper, metaphysical arrogance dies hard among men who claim to speak for science. Positivism, which equates all genuine knowledge with natural science, is more influential to-day than it was in the days of Auguste Comte. The acceptance of materialism as the philosophy of science is spread more widely now than in any previous generation. It has become the official creed of both Russia and China, and is being made the basis of the education and culture of both the Russian and Chinese peoples. Mr. Maurice Cornforth writes an able exposition of the Marxists' dialectical materialism and bases on it a critique of the fashionable schools of Logical Analysis. He calls his book, *Science Versus Idealism*, though Marxism is not science, and logical analysis is not idealism. But it is not only among Marxists that the bourgeois rationalism of the mid-Victorian era continues to flourish. Many disciples of Freud are unable to dissociate his technique from his naïve dismissal of religion as illusion. With their master, they assume that religion must be essentially wishful thinking and that the methods of science are the only road to knowledge. 'Science is no illusion. But it would be an illusion to suppose that we could get anywhere else what it cannot give us.'

There are also tendencies, which seem to me misleading, to deny or ignore personality in the name of a supposedly scientific philosophy. 'The "ego" is not an entity, but only a name which we give to "a coherent organization of mental processes"' (Freud). Criticizing the famous '*Cogito: ergo sum*' of Descartes, Mr. Bertrand Russell suggests that in the premiss 'I think,' the word 'I' is really illegitimate. 'He ought to state his ultimate premiss in the form "there are thoughts." The word "I" is gramatically convenient, but does not describe a datum.' This seems to me a curious example of the desire to eliminate the ego. A similar unjustified elimination occurs when Freud talks loosely of ideas as conscious or unconscious. 'Experience shows that a mental element (*i.e.*, an idea) is not as a rule permanently conscious.' In fact experience shows nothing of the kind. It shows that *we* are not continuously aware of ideas. *We* are conscious or unconscious of ideas. Ideas are neither conscious nor unconscious.

If the self is thus belittled, ignored or denied, the concept of mind is also to be remodelled and subordinated to the activity of the brain. This simple identification of the mind with the brain was assumed in the autobiography of H. G. Wells. He constantly referred to the story of his mental evolution as the history of his brain. Certainly he did not, and indeed he could not, write the history of his brain, but if he could have related the changes that occurred in his brain, the history might have been of interest to physiologists but

of little or no interest to the general reader. It would not have been the record of the changes of his beliefs and opinions. It is far too easily assumed that the brain thinks and not that *we* think with our brains.

In the name of science we are still being asked to accept metaphysical falsehoods. From the side of religion there is less tendency than there was to question the findings of science or to set limits to scientific inquiry. If religion is not producing or maintaining so many scientific falsehoods as it did at one time, it must be admitted that many believers cling to conceptions of authority in religion which do not go well with the scientific outlook. In some quarters the advances of science are either ignored or regarded with apprehension. There is not among believers generally an adequate appreciation of the adventure of science, of its significance for the spiritual life of man. In his Presidential Address to the British Association in 1953, Sir Edward Appleton made two points which ought to be familiar to every Christian. Early in that address he said, ' Perhaps the most striking fact about modern science in its exploration, ranging from the heart of the atom to the frontiers of the universe, is that, like poetry, like philosophy, it reveals depths and mysteries beyond—and, this is important, quite different from—the ordinary matter-of-fact world we are used to. Science has given back to the universe, one might say, this quality of inexhaustible richness and unexpectedness which at one time it seems to have taken away from it.' Incidentally, it should be easier for the Christian to welcome and appreciate this aspect of modern science than it is for the rationalist and the materialist, yet in fact few are thrilled by it as they might be. Sir Edward Appleton closed his address with a reference to the scientist's calling. ' We scientists are specially fortunate in this, that our vocation can never be simply an occupation ; it is, by its very nature, more than that—a dedication to an end. It often seems to me that what we lack in the world to-day is not so much the impulse to dedication as the opportunity for it. This at least the scientist need never lack : the opportunity is open to him everywhere—" to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield." ' As expressed in a line from Dante, which Sir Edward Appleton cites in this connexion, science bears witness to the truth that ' we are not formed to live like brutes but to follow virtue and knowledge.' Science and religion would be more closely linked if more Christians adopted a variant of one clause in the Lord's Prayer that was loved by Rendel Harris,—' Give us this day, our daily discovery.' In any case, it is true that the Church has often been so preoccupied with the theme of sin and redemption that God's purpose for man in creation, which science is meant to fulfil, has been overlooked and forgotten.

Happily, there are signs that the relations of science and religion are being better understood in widening circles, and the possibilities of amicable coexistence are being more generally recognized. A recent series of broadcasts on the theme of science and religion brought many scientists to testify to the association of religious faith with scientific knowledge. An earlier proposal for a truce in the conflict between science and religion by delimiting spheres no longer satisfies. It is not enough to claim reason, facts and knowledge for science and to assign emotion, values and aspirations to religion. It is rather the case that science and religion represent different approaches to and different interpretations of one and the same reality. The two approaches are both legitimate and both necessary. The two lines of interpretation are distinct and must not be confused, but they need not conflict. Evolution and creation are not incompatible opposed ideas, though the first is a scientific hypothesis and the second a religious conviction. Progress and providence are not alternative hypotheses between which we have to choose, as J. B. Bury assumed in his book, *The Idea of Progress*. If progress could be demonstrated empirically, and if science could discover a law of progress, faith in providence would not be undermined. When T. H. Huxley said, ' the man of science has learned to believe in justification, not by faith, but by verification,' his antithesis depended on his idea of faith as a blind uncritical acceptance of a creed on authority. But for one who puts his trust in God, the life of faith is not unlike the scientist's process of verification. Justification by faith and justification by verification are not so far apart as Huxley supposed. The definition of faith, in the letter to the Hebrews, as ' that which gives substance to our hopes, which convinces us of things we cannot see ' (Knox's version) is applicable to both the scientific and the religious quests. Like the scientist, the believer is also an empiricist. ' John Wesley observed that spiritual experience is to faith what sense-experience is to reason.' George Fox was not making an idle boast when he spoke of knowing God *experimentally*.

The growing sense that the tension between science and religion may be resolved in a genuine harmony was admirably interpreted in an evening discourse by Professor C. A. Coulson, delivered at Oxford during the Annual Meeting of the British Association in 1954. He has since developed the main themes of the address in his book, *Science and Christian Belief*. Broadly speaking, the

change in men's outlook on science and religion is due to the recognition of the human element, the personal factor, in science and more particularly in physics. The rationalist and the materialist had been over-confident in their acceptance of Epicurean and Newtonian atomism. The solid hard impenetrable movable particles of this form of atomic theory are not basically real. 'These little particles were a framework on which the behaviour of earths and moons and falling stones could be exhibited in such a fashion that it made sense. It was Newton's greatness that he could himself invent these impenetrable moving particles: for they were his creation, not God's.' [1] Presumably Newton borrowed the particles from Democritus or Lucretius. In any case, they do not represent ultimate physical reality. But the point of the breakdown of the old atomic theory is the recognition that all such theories are human creations, and that what seemed most assured in them is subject to revision.

Perhaps even more effective in delivering scientists from the narrowmindedness of scientific humanists, from bondage to what Bonhoeffer called 'the meretricious concept of the empirically verifiable' advanced by the logical positivists, is the concept of 'complementarity.' The physicist finds himself working alternately with differing and apparently irreconcilable concepts. Professor Coulson thus describes the situation. 'Physics itself . . . is absolutely riddled with . . . apparent equivocations. Thus we work both with geometrical and wave optics: we treat electricity as sometimes a continuous flowing substance and sometimes as a discontinuous flow of electrons: and even of holes: we assert that heat is a form of kinetic energy, but we set up equations for the flow of heat just as if it were the old-fashioned substance caloric. We have grown so used to all this that no one bothers much about it.' [2] The scientist can no longer assert that 'one and only one description of any situation can be true.' There is no reason at all why the scientist's cosmology and the Christian view of God and the world should not both be true.

It is not surprising that the necessity of operating with complementary frames of reference in physics should make it easier for scientists and indeed for all of us to recognize that the scientific and religious approaches to reality may both be true. Years ago, Streeter, in his book, *Reality*, suggested that the scientific view of the universe may be compared to an ordnance survey map, while the religious is more like a picture and resembles an artist's vision and interpretation. There is no necessary conflict between the surveyor's map and the artist's landscape painting, and certainly no advance in the work of the surveyor will ever take the place of the art of John Constable, to name only one of our landscape painters.

To borrow a suggestion from Professor L. J. Russell, in religion and in science we are following out different basic principles for understanding the world and our position in it. In religion we are concerned with providence and the moral order, in science we are concerned with causation and the natural order. According to Professor Russell, ultimately neither principle can be proved or disproved, and they are not mutually exclusive. We may carry the argument a stage further, if we remember that in science we are exploring the realm of physical necessity and in religion the realm of human freedom and responsibility. Those realms are so far from being mutually exclusive that they are in fact interdependent. We live and are obliged to live in two orders, distinguishable though interconnected. This was one of the main themes of John Oman's *The Natural and the Supernatural*, and the truth of the matter seems to me to be presented in the following passage. 'On the one hand, the world has a frame which is so far at least of a fixed quantity that it is capable of being measured and mathematically formulated as cause and effect, so that the present seems to have been determined by the past; on the other, all our dealing with the world is by meaning, which is of quality and on which we act not by impulse behind us but by purpose before us, so that the present seems to be determined in view of the future. *Both are reliable orders and the rationality of the world depends at least as much on the latter as on the former.*' [3] In a subsequent passage Oman said: 'Just as a universe without freedom has no meaning and without meaning no reality, so freedom, without a universe which is not its mere creation, has no meaning and without meaning no reality. As the one reduces the world to a continuity of persistent motion, the other reduces it to sporadic acts of self-assertion.' [4] The rationalist may protest that a world which is nothing but a continuity of persistent motion, a world without meaning, in Oman's sense of the word, may still be the only real world. But if this were so we could never know it, for science is only possible for morally responsible human beings who entertain purposes and are free to act on them. Science would not be possible in a world which was nothing but a continuity of persistent motion. Science explores the realm of necessity, but it

[1] See Coulson's address, in *The Advancement of Science*, XI. xliii. 325.

[2] *Ib.*, 327.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 152. Italics mine.

[4] *Ib.*, 229.

depends on the realm of freedom. Robert Browning's ' all's love and all's law ' enshrines the same truth. We are dealing with one world, and we deal with it on two differing but complementary principles.

Perhaps more important than the concept of complementarity in physics is the revision of the theory of knowledge involved in Martin Buber's book, *I and Thou*. Scientific knowledge is based on our relations with things rather than with persons, and perhaps one might say on our relations with inanimate rather than with living things. It is built up on impersonal, ' I and it,' relations or at best on third-personal, ' I and them,' relations. But any intimate knowledge of persons must be based on ' I and Thou ' relations. Such knowledge goes beyond scientific knowledge. This way of knowing belongs to the lover, the poet, the mystic, and the saint. *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, poetry and truth,—it is difficult for the scientist to admit that the poet may have a way of knowing different from his. Yet the claim that natural science is the only genuine form of knowledge is indefensible. There is likewise a cognitive element in the experience of the mystic, the saint and the prophet, and we cannot expect to share this knowledge unless we share their experience. We might then parody Freud's aphorism. ' Religion is no illusion, but it would be an illusion to seek to gain from natural science answers to questions which only religion can answer.'

Recent Foreign Theology

Pauline Studies. A large and impressive book of Pauline studies has been published by Professor Johannes Munck, of Aarhus.[1] The author does not trace the life of Paul, or concern himself systematically with his missionary journeys, but confines himself to a number of questions of crucial importance, and especially questions that deal with the teaching of the Apostle. The accounts of the call of Paul, his treatment of the judaizing Gentile converts in the Epistle to the Galatians, his conception of a Church not divided into parties as reflected in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, his conception of the true apostleship as reflected in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, his manifesto of the faith in the Epistle to the Romans, his teaching on Israel and the Gentiles, his relations with Jerusalem, and his trial and appeal to Cæsar, are amongst the subjects treated. In addition there is a chapter on the Tübingen School, and one on Jewish Christianity as reflected in Acts.

The author is well acquainted with modern literature on Paul, and on every question weighs the varying views which have been advanced. Quite apart from the setting forth of his own balanced views, which cannot be summarized in this brief note, his work will be found of high value as an introduction to recent study in this field, and no serious student of the mission and teaching of the Apostle can afford to neglect it. Yet beyond this, the author brings his own stimulating mind to every question, and is not content simply to reflect his predecessors, but offers many acute comments and a solid contribution to the understanding of the Apostle's mind and of the situations which confronted him.

[1] *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (*Acta Jutlandica*, Theology Series, No. 6) [1954]. Munksgaard, Copenhagen ; Danish Kr. 28.

Kerygma and Myth. The controversy which Bultmann's demythologizing of the gospel raised still goes on, and in the series *Theologische Forschung* two issues are devoted to this subject. One is the third volume issued under the title *Kerygma and Myth*, with the sub-title *The Debate with Philosophy*.[2] About half the volume—the whole contains some one hundred pages—consists of a criticism of Bultmann by Karl Jaspers, followed by a short reply from Bultmann and another by H. W. Fritsch, the editor of the volume and the series, together with short papers by Fritz Buri and Kurt Reidemeister, the latter dealing with ' The Origin of Bultmann's Theology.'

The second of these recent volumes is by Fritsch, and it offers a review of *The Present-Day Position of the Demythologizing Debate*,[3] as a supplement to *Kerygma and Myth*, vols. i. and ii. Here the author first surveys the discussion as to the significance of Bultmann's ideas for the Church, and the question how far they are rightly to be tolerated by the Church. He then turns to the hermeneutical problem, after which he comes to the more interesting, and perhaps more debated, question of the relation of Kerygma and History, and a short summing up.

[2] *Kerygma und Mythos*, iii. : *Das Gespräch mit der Philosophie* (*Theologische Forschung*, 5) [1954]. Herbert Reich, Evangelischer Verlag, Hamburg-Volksdorf ; DM 6.00.

[3] *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Entmythologisierungs-Debatte. Beiheft zu Kerygma und Mythos i.–ii.* (*Theologische Forschung*, 7) [1954]. DM 4.80.

By now most people who are interested in this controversy have made up their minds either for or against Bultmann—and many who share his desire to present the gospel in terms intelligible to the modern mind are persuaded that he throws out the baby with the bath water in his discounting of the historical basis of the Gospels—but any whose appetite for the discussion is still unsatisfied will find these little books of interest.

Revelation and Tradition. In the same series of studies stands a very brief treatment, which claims to be no more than an outline, of the large theme of *Revelation and Tradition*.[1] The author, G. Gloege, summarizes in three pages post-Tridentine Catholic teaching on these themes, and in a further three pages the old Protestant teaching. Six pages suffice to summarize the teaching of the Old Testament and four pages that of the New, while ten pages are devoted to a setting forth of the 'dogmatic outlines' of the relation between revelation and tradition. To the reviewer it seems that too much ground is covered in too short a space, and while we are only offered an outline, something more than an outline is needed for the profitable treatment of such a subject.

Moses. In 1954 the journal *Cahiers Sioniens* devoted its numbers 2, 3, and 4 to a collection of articles on Moses. These have now been published in a substantial volume of more than four hundred pages, which may be warmly commended for their collection of material which could only be sought elsewhere in widely different works.[2] It is possible to do little more than list the contents here.

H. Cazelles contributes a chapter on Moses as a figure of history, firmly maintaining his historicity and placing the Exodus in the thirteenth century B.C. A. Gelin then examines the part Moses plays in the Old Testament. A short chapter on Philo's *Life of Moses* by B. Botte then follows, and is succeeded by a valuable chapter on Moses in the inter-testamental literature by G. Vermès. Next comes the longest chapter in the book. This is by the gifted Renée Bloch, who was killed in an unhappy aeroplane accident in 1955, and it deals with Moses in Rabbinic tradition. A. Descamps and P. Démann deal with Moses in the Gospels and in Paul, while R. M. Tonneau turns to the Syrian Fathers and J. Daniélou to Gregory of Nyssa. The Latin Fathers and the mediævals are studied by A. Luneau and J. Châtillon. Moses' place in the synagogue liturgy is considered by K. Hruby, and in the Byzantine Rite by J. Blanc, while iconography has a short chapter from the pen of J. Leroy. The final section turns to Islam, the place of Moses in the Qur'an being assigned to Y. Moubarac, and Sufi traditions to L. Gardet.

No reader can fail to be richly instructed by this volume, since it covers so wide a field. It is not addressed to the specialist, and in view of its range could not be; but its authors are well versed in their subjects, and mediate much to their readers, whose gratitude they have abundantly earned.

The Books of Chronicles. Professor W. Rudolph has contributed to Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*[3] a work of major importance in his commentary on the much neglected Books of Chronicles. It contains, like all the volumes of the series, a short Introduction, a new translation of the text, with text-critical notes and exegesis. Full attention is paid to the proper names, and to the identification of the location of the geographical names. Account is taken of recent archaeology, and the work is, in every sense, up-to-date. The textual critic will find much to interest him, as also will the reader who is interested in higher criticism.

The compilation of the Chronicler's work is dated early in the fourth century B.C. This date is defended at the cost of removing a good deal of the work from the Chronicler himself to later hands. Here the reviewer is doubtful. For Rudolph rightly finds in the predominant interests of the Chronicler the clue to the understanding of his work. One of those interests is the limitation of the people of God to the Jews, and the elimination of Northern Israel from the field of his interest. This would appear to reflect an anti-Samaritan feeling, and strongly suggests that the Samaritan schism was definitive in his time. The reviewer is not persuaded that it was definitive so early as the beginning of the fourth century, though he will not come down so far as some writers in dating the Chronicler.

Rudolph finds more historical value in these books than some writers have done, and is less disposed to dismiss the writer as of scant spiritual worth than has been common. Here the reviewer is in full agreement. The Chronicler's interest in the cultus is patent, but that he values the cultus merely for its own sake is not so certain. Throughout the commentary the learning and judgment of the author are apparent, and this book will immediately take its place as the most important commentary on these books available for our use.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University.

---

[1] *Offenbarung und Uberlieferung: ein dogmatischer Entwurf* (*Theologische Forschung*, No. 6) [1954]. DM 3.60.

[2] *Moïse: L'Homme de l'Alliance* [1955]. Desclée et Cie, Tournai.

[3] *Chronikbücher* (*Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, i. *Reihe*, No. 21) [1955]. Mohr, Tübingen; DM. 24.40, or bound 27.40.

Entre Nous

Crusader's Passion

On 12th January, 1837, Carlyle's 'History of the French Revolution' was first published. Naturally Carlyle's friends wondered what the critics and reviewers would do with it. Carlyle's answer was: 'You have not had for a hundred years any book that came more direct and flamingly from the heart of a living man. Do what you like with it, you——' If one thing is certain about Father Trevor Huddlestone's *Naught for Your Comfort* (Collins; 12s. 6d. net), it is that it is written directly and flamingly from the heart.

Father Huddlestone is a member of the Anglican Community of the Resurrection. He did not go to Africa with a burning zeal to be a social reformer; the conditions of South Africa set alight that flame within him. He makes no attempt to write this book with judicial detachment. 'What I shall try to avoid is that most common and persistent error in all such assessments—the attempt to be impartial. By this I mean that I shall write this book as a partisan, for I believe that Christians are committed in the field of human relationships to a partisan approach. I believe that, because God became Man, therefore human nature in itself has a dignity and value which is infinite. I believe that this conception naturally carries with it the idea that the State exists for the individual, not the individual for the State. Any doctrine based on racial or colour prejudice and enforced by the State is therefore an affront to human dignity and "ipso facto" an insult to God Himself.'

Father Huddlestone believes that in South Africa there is no such thing as justice for the coloured people. On the Thursday before Easter Jacob Ledwaba was arrested for being out after curfew without his pass. Since it was Easter he was kept in prison until the Saturday morning. In prison he was so violently kicked that he came home to die with a bladder injury; and in the case that followed his death was attributed to congenital syphilis. The African convict-labourer, Elias Mpikwa, was beaten to death with a hose-pipe by the farmer for whom he was working. The farmer was found guilty of nothing worse than common assault. Not even the equity of the law can protect the coloured people as Father Huddlestone sees it.

Father Huddlestone believes that there is in South Africa no hope of true education for the coloured people. In August, 1954, the South African Government made it quite impossible for the Mission Schools to continue. They had to choose between handing themselves over entirely to the Government or accepting a much diminished and finally vanishing subsidy. This action was deliberate. The Bantu Education Act declares that the aim of education is to equip the Bantu child 'for his future work and surroundings.' But in introducing the Bill Dr. Verwoerd said: 'I want to remind Hon. Members that if the native of South Africa to-day, in any kind of school in existence, is being taught to expect that he will live his adult life under a policy of equal rights, he is making a big mistake.' It is 'education for servitude.'

Even in the Church the coloured people have no real rights. The Rev. C. B. Brink of the Dutch Reformed Church said: 'It is true that the unity of the congregation of Christ is clearly shown at the Table of the Lord. At the moment, however, a common Communion of all races on a large scale in South Africa would scarcely be edifying.'

Father Huddlestone has no doubt that the Christian is bound to use every effort to fight this racialism. The Archbishop of Canterbury told him: 'You are entirely wrong in the methods you are using to fight this situation. . . . The Christian must never use force . . . must never use the same weapon as his opponent.' A distinguished Canadian told him he ought to be a bit more Christian in his views, and that he ought to love his enemies! Father Huddlestone is quite clear where the Church's duty lies here: 'I would in fact deny absolutely that "political weapons are not to be used by Christians, for I believe that the Christian is bound to act politically wherever he may be: that if the Church refuses to accept responsibility in the political sphere as well as in the strictly theological sphere, then she is guilty of betraying the very foundation of her faith; the Incarnation. It is when the Church has so abdicated her position of political trust that the State, freed from any absolute higher than itself, has assumed a totalitarian shape and a dictatorial attitude. This is a matter of history, not of opinion.'

Jeffrey once said to Carlyle: 'You are so dreadfully in earnest.' Here is a book by a man who is passionately in earnest. Father Huddlestone cuts through all prudentialities. His question is, not, Is it possible? but, Is it right? As we read this book, we will be moved to exclaim: 'Thank God that the prophets are not yet dead.'

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.